17659

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

CANADA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR.....JACQUES LOUIS PLAMONDON.....

TITLE OF THESIS.....CONSULTATIVE NEEDS OF TEACHERS.....

.....

UNIVERSITY.....THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA.....

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED.....M. Ed.....

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED.....1973.....

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed).....Jacques Plamondon.....

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

Box 325

Lac La Biche,

Alberta

DATED....August 24....1973

NL-91 (10-68)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

CONSULTATIVE NEEDS OF TEACHERS

by

© JACQUES LOUIS PLAMONDON

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1973

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis intitled "Consultative Needs of Teachers," submitted by Jacques Louis Plamondon in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

E.A. Holdaway
.....
Supervisor

.....

.....

Date.. August 1, 1973.

ABSTRACT

This study sought to obtain teachers' perceptions of needs for consultative assistance. The opinions of teachers were examined in the following areas:

1. Needs for assistance in the consultative task areas investigated;

2. The type of personnel perceived as best able to meet consultative needs;

3. Released time for selected consultative personnel; and

4. Other matters related to consultation.

A questionnaire was administered to the 141 teachers of the St. Albert Protestant Separate School District. Usable returns totalled 135 questionnaires (97 percent). In addition, four teachers from each of the five schools participated in a structured interview.

Eighty percent of teachers indicated that they would like consultative assistance in 10 out of the 28 consultative task area statements. The four highest areas were as follows: "Information on background of students," "Assessing the need for remedial programs," "Implementing remedial programs," and "Developing course outlines."

When related task areas were grouped under appropriate headings, the following categories of personnel were selected as a first choice by teachers: "Curriculum and

Program Development" (department heads), "Instructional Materials" (another teacher), "Student Measurement and Evaluation" (guidance personnel), "Meeting Specific Student Needs" (guidance personnel), and "Other Areas" (principals).

Teachers generally agreed that department heads should be given more released time for consultation. Teachers also favored giving teachers of recognized ability released time on a scheduled basis to provide consultative help.

Regarding other matters related to consultation, a majority of teachers expressed the opinion that assistant principals should not act as consultants for most subject areas, principals should spend more time in consultation with teachers, university staff can fill certain consultative needs, and staff development meetings should be held mostly in the school where they teach rather than in another location.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge Mr. Gish, Superintendent of Schools, for his permission and assistance in conducting the study in the St. Albert Protestant Separate School District. To his administrative and teaching staff, sincere thanks are expressed for their participation.

Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. E.A. Holdaway for his invaluable assistance throughout the study. The advice and comments of Dr. R.C. Bryce and Dr. P.J. Miller were very helpful.

Thanks are due to Mrs. Christiane Prokop for her assistance with computer programming. The efforts of those who assisted in the testing of the instrument and the treatment of the data are recognized.

To my Mother, Father, and to Leona a debt of gratitude is owed for their constant encouragement and their ready assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1.	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS	1
	Introduction	1
	THE PROBLEM	2
	Statement of Problem 1	3
	Statement of Problem 2	4
	Statement of Problem 3	4
	Statement of Problem 4	5
	DEFINITION OF TERMS	6
	OVERVIEW OF THE THESIS	7
2.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
	INTRODUCTION	9
	CONSULTATION: A FUNCTION OF SUPERVISION	9
	Supervision	10
	Consultation	12
	THE CONSULTATIVE ROLE AND FUNCTION	13
	CANADIAN RESEARCH STUDIES	20
	Summaries	21
	More recent studies	23
	SUMMARY	26
3.	RESEARCH DESIGN	28
	INSTRUMENTATION	28
	The Questionnaire	28

Chapter | Page

Validity of the Instrument 29

The Structured Interview 30

DATA COLLECTION 30

LIMITATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS 32

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESPONDENTS 32

SUMMARY 34

4. TEACHERS' NEED FOR CONSULTATIVE ASSISTANCE. 36

SUB-PROBLEM 1.1 36

SUB-PROBLEM 1.2 43

Responses Classified by Sex 43

Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education 44

Responses Classified by Total Years of Experience 45

Responses Classified by Grade Level . . 50

Responses Classified by Position in the School 50

SUB-PROBLEM 1.3 53

Responses Classified by Grade Level and Years of Post-Secondary Education 54

Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education and Total Years of Teaching Experience . 55

Responses Classified by Grade Level and Total Years of Teaching Experience 57

SUMMARY 59

5. TEACHERS' SELECTION OF CONSULTATIVE PERSONNEL 63

SUB-PROBLEM 2.1 63

Chapter Page

Principal 63
Librarian 64
Other Resource Personnel 64
Guidance Personnel 65
Department Head 65
Another Teacher 66
University Personnel 66
Department of Education Consultants . . 71
Assistant Principals 71
District Office Staff 71
SUB-PROBLEM 2.2 71
Curriculum and Program Development . . 72
Instructional Materials 73
Methodology and Instructional Techniques 73
Student Measurement and Evaluation . . 73
Meeting Specific Student Needs 77
Other Areas 77
SUB-PROBLEM 2.3 79
SUMMARY 79
6. OTHER MATTERS RELATED TO CONSULTATION . . . 82
PROBLEM 3 82
Sub-Problem 3.1 82
Sub-Problem 3.2 83
Sub-Problem 3.3 83
Sub-Problem 3.4 86

Chapter Page

PROBLEM 4 88
Sub-Problem 4.1 88
Sub-Problem 4.2 92
Sub-Problem 4.3 92
Sub-Problem 4.4 93
Sub-Problem 4.5 94
SUMMARY 98

7. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS . . 107
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 107
SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS 107
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS 112
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 115

BIBLIOGRAPHY 117

APPENDIX 123
QUESTIONNAIRE 124
STRUCTURED INTERVIEW 133
KEY TO ABRIDGED TASK AREA STATEMENTS . . . 137

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Analysis of the Consultation Function . . .	18
2.	Distribution of Questionnaires	31
3.	Characteristics of Questionnaire Respondents	33
4.	Characteristics of Interview Respondents	35
5.	Percentage Responses of Teachers' Need for Assistance in Each Consultative Task Area	38
6.	Most Valuable Consultative Functions as Seen by Interviewees	41
7.	Needs of Interviewees during Their First Year of Teaching	42
8.	Significant Differences Obtained Using Chi Square Test with Selected Dependent Variables and Task Area Statements . . .	46
9.	Relationship Seen by Interviewees between Experience and Need for Consultative Services	51
10.	Selection of Most Important Task Areas for Teachers Classified by Grade Level and Years of Post-Secondary Education	56
11.	Selection of Most Important Task Areas for Teachers Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education and Total Years of Teaching Experience	58
12.	Selection of Most Important Task Areas for Teachers Classified by Grade Level and Total Years of Teaching Experience . . .	60
13.	Ranking of Three Classes of Personnel Selected Most Frequently as a Source of Assistance in Each of the Consultative Task Areas	67

Table		Page
14.	Personnel Selected as a Source of Assistance to Meet Consultative Needs in Grouped Task Areas	74
15.	Ranking of the Three Highest Personnel Selected as a Source of Assistance by Grouped Task Areas	78
16.	Ranking of Total Response to Each Category of Personnel as a Source of Assistance	80
17.	Percentage Distribution of Opinions of Respondents on Matters Related to Consultative Needs	84
18.	Test of Independence Concerning Whether Department Heads Should Be Given More Released Time for Consultation	89
19.	Test of Independence Concerning Whether Released Time for Department Heads Should Be at the Expense of Released Time for Assistant Principals	90
20.	Test of Independence Concerning Whether Classroom Teachers of Recognized Ability Should Be Released To Provide Consultative Help	91
21.	Approach Selected by Interviewees Best Serving Their Needs in Consultative Areas	95
22.	Test of Independence Concerning Whether Assistant Principals Should Act as Consultants for Most Subject Areas	99
23.	Test of Independence Concerning Whether Principals Should Spend More Time in Consultation with Teachers	100
24.	Test of Independence Concerning Whether Staff Development Meetings Should Be Held Mostly in each Individual School	101
25.	Test of Independence Concerning Whether University Staff Can Fill Certain Needs in Consultative Services	102

Table		Page
26.	Summary of Additional Comments in the Questionnaire	104
27.	Additional Comments Gathered from Interviewees	105
28.	Key to Abridged Task Area Statements . . .	137

Chapter 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS

A number of studies focusing in whole or in part upon consultation have been conducted at The University of Alberta (McLoughlin, 1965; Hewko, 1965; Harrison, 1965: McGillivray, 1966; Clarke, 1968; Milne, 1968; Duboyce, 1969; Heron, 1969; Humphreys, 1970; Cowle, 1971; Chapman, 1972; Haughey, 1972).

Information relative to consultation has been obtained regarding the amount and the nature of existing consultative assistance (for example, Ratsoy, 1968; Haughey, 1972). In addition, the roles of specific consultative personnel have been investigated: the supervisor of instruction (McLoughlin, 1965); the regional office consultant (Chapman, 1972); the principal (Morin, 1964); the elementary school coordinator (Cowle, 1971); the junior high school coordinator (Hewko, 1965; Heron, 1969); and the department head (Clarke, 1969; Grey, 1972).

However, very few Canadian research studies have attempted to investigate what teachers perceive to be their needs for consultative assistance and which personnel they see as being best able to meet these needs. In a recent Ontario study Parsons (1971:5) considered the following problems:

1. What are teachers' perceptions of the influence of various supervisory positions on their behavior;

2. What are teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of various supervisory positions in improving their behavior; and

3. What are teachers' selections of the most effective and least effective supervisory positions?

Two writers have stressed that the examination of the types of assistance made available to teachers should take a similiar direction. Miklos (1971:10) suggested that we should be thinking:

> . . . not of how many people do we have, or how they go about their work, but instead of what functions are assigned to them and where are they located within the structure of the organization.

Franseth (1965:9) reported that most participants in a study which examined supervision in the rural schools of the United States agreed that supervision is most effective when:

1. "It contributes significantly to the solution of problems considered important by the teachers as well as the supervisor"; and

2. "The teachers help decide what the supervisory service should be."

THE PROBLEM

This study sought to obtain the opinions held by teachers regarding the need for consultative assistance and

the type of personnel best able to meet these needs.

Statement of Problem 1

In which consultative task areas do teachers see the greatest need for consultative assistance?

Sub-problem 1.1. What are teachers' opinions of the need for assistance in the consultative task areas examined?

Sub-problem 1.2. To what extent are differences in teachers' perceptions of the need for assistance in the consultative task areas associated with:

1. Sex of the teacher;
2. Years of post-secondary education;
3. Total years of teaching experience;
4. Grade level; and
5. Position held in the school?

Sub-problem 1.3. Do teachers' perceptions of the need for consultative assistance differ in the task areas teachers consider most important on the basis of:

1. Grade level and years of post-secondary education;
2. Years of post-secondary education and total years of teaching experience; and
3. Grade level and total years of teaching experience?

Statement of Problem 2

Which type of personnel do teachers perceive as being best able to meet their consultative needs?

Sub-problem 2.1. What are teachers' perceptions of the personnel best able to meet their needs for assistance in each of the consultative task areas?

Sub-problem 2.2. Which personnel do teachers feel are best able to meet their needs for consultative assistance in the following grouped task areas:

1. Curriculum and program development;
2. Instructional materials;
3. Methodology and instructional techniques;
4. Student measurement and evaluation;
5. Meeting specific student needs; and
6. Other areas?

Sub-problem 2.3. What are the responses of teachers to each category of personnel as a source of assistance?

Statement of Problem 3

What opinions do teachers hold with regard to released time for selected consultative personnel?

Sub-problem 3.1. Do teachers feel that more released time for consultation should be given to department heads?

Sub-problem 3.2. Do teachers feel that, if

released time for department heads were made available, it should be at the expense of released time for assistant principals?

Sub-problem 3.3. Do teachers feel that teachers of recognized ability, who are not in any designated administrative position should be released on a scheduled basis to provide consultative help?

Sub-problem 3.4. To what extent are differences in opinions regarding released time for selected consultative personnel associated with:

1. Sex of the teacher;
2. Years of post-secondary education;
3. Total years of teaching experience;
4. Grade level; and
5. Position held in the school?

Statement of Problem 4

What opinions do teachers hold on other matters related to consultation?

Sub-problem 4.1. Do teachers feel that assistant principals should act as consultants for most subject areas?

Sub-problem 4.2. Do teachers feel that principals should spend more time in consultation with teachers?

Sub-problem 4.3. Do teachers feel that university staff can fill certain needs in consultative services?

Sub-problem 4.4. Do teachers feel that staff development meetings should be held mostly in the school where they teach rather than in another location?

Sub-problem 4.5. To what extent are differences in teachers' perceptions on consultative matters examined in Problem 4 associated with:

1. Sex of the teacher;
2. Years of post-secondary education;
3. Total years of teaching experience;
4. Grade level, and
5. Position held in the school?

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Significant terms which were used in this study are indicated in the sub-headings which follow.

Consultation

Consultation was used in the broad sense of any exchange of advice and assistance between personnel in the educational setting. Hence, consultative assistance was intended to include all services which help teachers with respect to curriculum, instruction, pupil and personal needs.

Consultative Task Areas

The statements in the second part of the questionnaire were intended to include all the types of consultative

assistance required by teachers to help them with their classroom instruction. Each of the statements included in the study were identified as consultative task areas.

Consultative Personnel

Consultative personnel were designated according to page 2 of the questionnaire. All were understood to be in current use by the teachers who responded to the questionnaire.

Teachers

The term "teachers" included all personnel holding a teaching certificate and located in schools. Teaching positions within schools were as follows: principal, assistant principal, department head/subject coordinator, counsellor, librarian, and classroom teacher. Throughout the study, the term "department head" was intended to include "subject coordinator."

OVERVIEW OF THE THESIS

This chapter has provided an outline of the research area, statements of problems and sub-problems, and a definition for each of the terms used.

Chapter 2 deals with a review of literature including: consultation as a function of supervision, the consultative role, and Canadian research studies.

The research methodology is presented in Chapter 3 in terms of the instrumentation, data collection procedures,

delimitations and assumptions.

Chapter 4 deals with the areas where teachers have expressed a need for consultation.

Chapter 5 provides teachers' perceptions of personnel best able to meet the consultative needs identified.

Other matters related to consultation and results of the personal interviews not used in Chapter 4 and 5 are described in Chapter 6.

A summary of the major findings, the conclusions, and the implications are found in Chapter 7.

A sample of the questionnaire, a copy of the structured interview, a key to the abridged version of the consultative task areas (Table 23), and relevant correspondence are contained in the Appendix.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In examining the available literature, Hamilton (1966:3-24), Crosby (Leeper, 1969:54), Wilson, et al., (1969:39-43), and MacKay (1969:13) found that no theory of supervision has really been developed. However, MacKay (1969:13) added that "there are many exhortative pieces of writing which attempt to spell out for the practitioner what constitutes 'effective supervision'." In defence of his study, Shipp (1970:33-34) argued:

> There has been very little theorizing in supervision yet there are numerous positions designed for supervisory personnel. The definition and role of supervision has been unclear.

Given this lack of theoretical formulation in supervision, this chapter will attempt to assemble the studies and the opinions of various writers to gain some notions of how consultation fits into the framework of supervision.

CONSULTATION: A FUNCTION OF SUPERVISION

Historical Themes

Many writers recognized that supervision as a function has evolved. Blessing (1968:12) outlined three phases: (1) the inspectoral, (2) the supervisory, and (3) presently, the consultative phase. He attributed the consultative point of view to the following developments:

(1) better trained teachers, (2) recent concepts in child development, (3) greater teacher militancy, and (4) different perception of the supervisor's role.

Referring more specifically to consultation, Miklos (1971:2) raised three historical themes: (1) inspection, (2) help given to teachers with methods and subject matter, and (3) more recently, the bringing of various forms of expertise by a group of people to solve a problem in a cooperative manner.

Parsons (1972:30-35) formulated five stages: (1) the "institutional control" phase, (2) the "program definition" phase, (3) the "scientific management" phase, (4) the "human relations" and "group dynamics" phase, and (5) "institutional growth processes" phase. The consultative phase as proposed by Blessing and raised by Miklos would be found operating in the two latter phases identified by Parsons.

Supervision

The supervision of instruction has been described by writers in various ways. One of the purposes of this chapter is to examine different perspectives on the topic to better describe consultation as a function of supervision. Harris (1968:11) looked at supervision in terms of one of its parameters:

> Supervision is what school personnel do with adults and things for the purpose of maintaining or changing the operation of the school in order to directly influence the attainment of the major instructional goals of the school.

In Enns' (1968b:284-285) opinion, the process of supervision encompasses five functions: staffing, motivation and stimulation, consultation, program development, and evaluation. He described this broad task of educational administration:

> It concerns mainly those particular activities and aspects which are intended to maintain and promote the effectiveness of learning and teaching by working directly with teachers.

Musella (1970:9) followed others such as Enns, MacKay, and Harris, by simply stating that "the primary purpose of supervision is to improve instruction." Neagley and Evans (1970:2-5) also wrote of school supervision as action to improve instruction. They identified three major principles and characteristics of modern school supervision:

1. It serves to establish and maintain satisfactory human relations among all staff members;
2. It is democratic; and
3. It is comprehensive in scope.

Franseth (1965:9-14) reported that the participants of a survey which examined supervision in selected rural schools in the U.S.A. generally agreed that:

> . . . good supervision is a resource, consultant, and leadership service which contributes significantly to the solution of problems which teachers consider important.

Blessing (1968:1-4) saw supervision as the way public schools attempt to bring about meaningful change or reduce the time lag between new knowledge and its implementation in practice:

> In essence, good supervision enables teachers to change the way they see things in the light of careful and cooperative study of facts. . . .It also helps teachers feel they are not working alone, but are partners in an important educational enterprise.

Wilson, et al., (1969:3) felt that supervision consisted in "planning an enabling environment for teaching and learning." They also showed support for Blessing when they talked of supervision as keeping up-to-date (1969:6). In discussing the "institutional growth" phase of supervision, Parsons (1972:34) used the same description.

More recently, supervision has been examined in a different light. Shipp (1970), Sergiovanni and Starratt (1971) have used psychological principles to develop a theory of humanistic supervision. Shipp (1970:295-298) presented a model using the writings of Rogers, Maslow, and Combs as primary sources, current literature, personal observation, and experience. Given a set of humanistic assumptions, he proposed that educational supervision provide for the personal growth of teachers. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1971:10) viewed the concept of supervision as a process "used by those in the schools who have responsibility for one or another aspect of the school's goals and who depend directly upon others to help them achieve these goals."

Consultation

Consultation was listed by many writers (Blessing, 1968; Miklos, 1971; Parsons, 1972) as a function of supervision. Its task is outlined by Enns (1968a:28-30) as

imparting knowledge to teachers, on a continuous basis,to solve instructional problems. In another article he (Enns, 1968b:288) felt this function was necessary to maintain teacher effectiveness by keeping up to current professional advances.

Foster (Leeper, 1969:31) added that consultation is a peer relationship which either person can break off at any time when one or the other feels that it is not fruitful.

In his survey of Ontario teachers Humphreys (1970: 24) used the term consultation services in determining the amount "of highly qualified and experienced teachers who are available for teachers who wish advice on some educational problem."

Miklos (1971:1-2) proposed that consultation be all the activities where professionals are seeking to improve practices by interacting with resource personnel or in other words "bringing expertise to bear upon problems."

THE CONSULTATIVE ROLE AND FUNCTION

Whittier (Lucio, 1969:9-13) recognized that supervisors have been abandoning roles which make them "quality control inspectors," "course-of-study writers," and "specialists in group dynamics." Continuing, he stressed that we should concentrate our efforts to define and redefine the function and position of the supervisor.

The theme of promoting growth has many supporters.

Babin (1972:18) saw the supervisor as an educational change agent promoting individual growth:

> . . . although no one supervisor can be all things to all the people he serves, his role could well be that of a catalyst who can support the teacher in his professional development. . . . The essence of his task would be to assist teachers to exploit their own potential in self-directed programs of growth.

Shipp (1970) drew a list of eight educational corollaries for each of the basic assumptions he proposed. They offer a framework for the consultative role within the parameters of humanistic supervision:

1. "The primary concern of the educational supervisor is the individual teacher as a unique and worthy being . . . . He analyzes the teacher's behavior in light of the teacher's perceptions and assumptions," (pp. 257-258).

2. "The supervisor must recognize that the teacher has a physical self, needs time and opportunities to perceive, and operates on selected goals and values," (p.260).

3. "The goal and function of supervision is to create the environment for this drive (to self-actualize) to take place," (p.262).

4. "Teachers have certain basic needs as human beings. The satisfaction of these needs influences the teacher's behavior," (p.264).

5. "In order for the supervisor to be of genuine help in providing the framework in which a teacher can grow personally and develop his own unique teaching style, the teacher must first look for help and direction from the

supervisor," (p.266).

6. "A teacher's personal growth in the supervisor-teacher relationship is facilitated when the supervisor is congruent and real, when he views the teacher with unconditional positive regard, and when he feels genuine empathy for the teacher," (p.269).

7. "Effective relationships between supervisors and teachers need time to grow and develop," (p.271).

McLoughlin (1972:16-18) has pointed out that the role of the supervisor is changing. He agreed with Ogletree (1972:509) who felt that supervisors in this era of change should be responsible for: (1) long-range instructional planning, (2) monitoring planned changes in programs, (3) program evaluation, and (4) experimentation.

Wilhelms (1970:36) discouraged the use of the "visit-critique" technique which is often used by supervisors. He argued that: (1) the time of generalists such as principals is too valuable; (2) this approach is psychologically wrong because it is only beneficial to the beginners and weaklings "who often crave to have you tell them what to do and how to do it"; and (3) assistance in the details of classrooms performance could better be met by department heads or experienced colleagues. He stated that supervision as a group activity is more economical and forces a movement away from the critic role toward the leader role.

Parsons (1972:34) suggested that further examination

and analysis were needed to change "what is" to "what ought to be" in this area. He insisted that: (1) teachers are professionals; (2) the process of planning must be concerned with removing "structural impediments to professionalism"; (3) there is a need for continued examination of our structures and roles.

In examining various approaches to consultation Miklos (1971:4-5,10) outlined a number of persistent problems in this area:

1. Increasing amounts of time are needed to coordinate instructional programs;

2. Innovations are diffused very slowly throughout the system;

3. There is a continuing unfilled need for more consultants and supervisors; and

4. Some personnel resources are underused or some consultant services are not used effectively. He concluded that:

> The source of the major problems for effective consultation is organizational, not individual and not procedural.

The following alternate approaches were proposed by Miklos (1971:11-19);

1. Place more responsibility on teachers for instructional improvement;

2. Make use of expertise at the school level;

3. Allow schools to initiate program improvement;

4. Give individual schools control over additional

resources to bring about program improvement;

5. Use more varied sources of expertise (for example, academic institutions, professional associations, other school systems);

6. Deal with the organizational and structural sources of instructional problems; and

7. Redefine functions of central office supervisory personnel to meet more effectively the needs of school systems.

In a recent paper, Harnett (Born, 1971:6) examined the area of intervisitation and concluded ". . . the inter-personal relationship and broadened professional contact--is the biggest advantage of intervisitation."

At a clinic for supervisors, Babin (1970:175) reported:

> Consensus was that, in the making of a teacher, it is highly probable that in-service training is definitely more important than pre-service training. In the former, one learns <u>about</u> teaching; in the latter, one learns <u>to teach</u>.

Musella (1970:15-20) promoted the implementation of a program of teacher development using such approaches as a "buddy" system and in-service work. He felt that an intensive program of teacher development will:

1. Increase educational results;

2. Develop new skills to meet changing educational patterns;

3. Insure better staff relationships; and

4. Provide for a reservoir of human resources.

Table 1

Analysis of the Consultative Function [a]

Type of Consultative Assistance	General Characteristics and Purpose	Personnel Initiating Assistance	Personnel Providing Assistance
Advice-Seeking	Assistance with immediate problems	Teacher	Colleagues Team Leader Principal
Performance Analysis	Desire to have objective appraisal of teaching learning situation	Teacher	Team Leader Dept. Head Principal Consultant
Diagnosis	Assistance with diagnosis of a vaguely-perceived problem	Teacher Supervisor	Colleagues Team Leader Dept. Head Principal Consultant Supervisor
Functional Expertise	Assistance with pupil problems, testing, audio-visual material, references, etc.	Teacher	Counsellors Librarians Technicians Psychologists Other Specialists
Curricular Expertise	Desire to improve the program; to introduce change	Teacher Supervisor	Team Members Resource Persons

[a] Table taken from Miklos (1971).

Franseth (1965:16-18) recognized that consultative assistance is given in the classroom, at staff meetings, at group conferences, and in the office. This is done by helping teachers plan and work with students, by taking part in action research, by assisting with innovative ideas, by providing specialized help, and in developing specialized programs.

Enns (1968a:10-14) preferred an approach which uses both directive and non-directive techniques. He added that success depends on the degree of trust in the consultant-consultee relationship. This has been somewhat supported by an interesting study conducted by Lindermann (1970:207-208) who recommended that formal evaluation of teachers should be part of the supervisor's role to promote or facilitate communication. He concluded that teachers communicated more frequently with their supervisors if they were being evaluated. Support for these results came from Unger who was quoted by Lindermann (1970:208) as stating that ". . . 'the greater the degree of predictability between principal and teacher, the greater the willingness of the teacher to adopt trusting attitudes'." This position is not in keeping with that held by Wiles (1967: 3-10), and others, who suggested that evaluation of teachers by supervisors is a barrier to effective communication.

Teitelebaum (Harris, 1963:437-438) found in an experimental program of assistance for newly appointed teachers in special service elementary schools in New York

(1961) that at the end of the year, the 120 experimental teachers who had access to 17 teacher-consultants employed to serve them, evaluated themselves significantly higher in the areas of planning, subject matter, and methodology than the control group of teachers.

Neagley and Evans (1970:135-136) summarized the advantages and disadvantages of assigning only a specialist advisory role to consultants. They listed the following as advantages:

1. Preserves teacher autonomy in the classroom;
2. Expert assistance is always on call; and
3. This makes best use of a specialist.

On the other hand a number of disadvantages were also acknowledged:

1. Some teachers do not recognize the need for help;
2. Services of consultants are not always used fully;
3. Some teachers may monopolize services of consultants; and
4. Consultants are not always available when needed.

CANADIAN RESEARCH STUDIES

Earlier it was stated that the Canadian literature on supervision had been reviewed by Hamilton (1966) and

MacKay (1969). Recently two researchers, Holdaway (1971) and Haughey (1972) have provided fairly extensive reviews on the Canadian literature written in the area of consultation. A summary of their findings are provided. In addition, research of more recent literature and of particular interest to this study will follow.

Holdaway (1971b:40) arrived at nine generalizations which summarize much of the research on consultation:

1. "A low percentage of total staff occupied full-time consultative positions," (Holdaway and Lepatski, 1969-70; Duboyce, 1969).

2. "People in full-time or part-time consultative positions cannot meet all of the demands for their services," (Duboyce, 1969; Humphreys, 1970).

3. "Some teachers do not perceive a need for consultative help" (Ratsoy, 1968-69).

4. "More consultative help is available to urban teachers than to rural teachers" (Humphreys, 1970; Ratsoy, 1969-70).

5. "Beginning teachers frequently do not receive sufficient help with their most serious problems," (Humphreys, 1970; McGillivray, 1966; Milne, 1968).

6. "Consultants should mostly give help to teachers in relation to problems perceived by teachers," (McLoughlin, 1965; Holdaway, 1971a).

7. "Principals usually cannot provide the specialist type of consultative help required by most

teachers. They can however do much with regard to providing a supportive, facilitating and motivating climate," (Harrison, 1965).

8. "Department heads should be able to provide consultative help upon request by teachers, but should not occupy line positions; their main functions are communication, consultation and coordination," (Clarke, 1968; Hewko, 1965; Cowle, 1971).

9. "Teaching staff whose duties include part-time consultation in a cluster of schools, are likely to be most successful in their resident school," (Hewko, 1965; Heron, 1969).

Haughey (1972:27) made the following conclusions from the Canadian literature reviewed:

1. "There are no clear guidelines between the roles of the principal and other personnel with regard to supervision," (Smelgrove, 1965; Pitsula, 1966; McLoughlin, 1965; Duboyce, 1969; Reiderer, 1965; Clarke, 1969; Heron, 1969).

2. "The conflicts in functions expected, the resistance against any type of evaluatory behavior, and the little time principals have available, tend to make the availability of consultative assistance a haphazard affair," (Hrynyk, 1962; Morin, 1964; Wetter, 1965; Ziolkowski, 1965; Young, 1967; Uhlman, 1966; Harrison, 1965; Gregory, 1972; Hewko, 1965; Heron, 1969).

3. "Research does indicate that in-school personnel

are most influential and effective in terms of consultative assistance," (Ulhman, 1966; Cowle, 1971; Hewko, 1966; Heron, 1969; McGillivray, 1966; Milne, 1968; Parsons, 1971).

More recent studies

Chapman (1972:66) examined the nature and the role of Regional Office of Education (ROE) in the Province of Alberta. He obtained his data from the 44 members of its professional staff. Consultants felt that the objectives of ROE were as follows:

1. The provision of consultative services to teachers, school administrators, and school boards was a major objective;

2. Evaluation was part of the consultative process but was not to be interpreted as "inspection" of schools or teachers;

3. Other objectives included were: (a) assistance with curriculum development, (b) acting as monitoring agents, and (c) facilitating communication among the educational systems. He also reported (Chapman; 1972:68) that the consultants felt the principal justification for ROE was provision of consultative services in rural areas which have had limited support staff and have experienced difficulty in keeping up with current educational ideas. A further justification for the emergence of ROE was the decentralization of central office.

Gray (1972) obtained opinions from principals and department heads relative to the position of department

head in Ottawa High Schools. For the purposes of this review only those points related to consultation are raised. Principals felt the most valuable attributes of the department head were as follows (Gray; 1972:164):

1. Professional leadership;

2. Supervision by a person in a position to lead by example;

3. Determination of the "academic climate" for the school.

Department heads perceived that their most valuable attributes were (p.164):

1. Autonomy in curriculum development, methods of teaching, professional growth, setting of department goals;

2. Personalized administration of teachers;

3. Leadership by a professionally competent person; and

4. Organization of people with common problems and goals into working groups for their mutual benefits.

Principals also reported that the system of supervision and administration by department heads could be improved by: (1) giving more time to carry out duties; (2) improving the calibre and training of personnel selected for the job, and (3) setting goals for their department and evaluating teachers against these goals. Finally principals felt that the role of the department head would be more effective if department heads: (1) were allotted more time for supervision, (2) were given more autonomy, (3) were granted

greater voice in decision-making, and (4) were given more support from other administrative levels.

Haughey (1972) conducted a study to determine the opinions of teachers in Alberta concerning staffing practices. Part of this study concerned itself with consultative services. Results from 1,558 Alberta teachers showed that (Haughey; 1972:152-154):

1. Fifty-nine percent of rural teachers and 24 percent of urban teachers indicated insufficient central office consultative personnel;

2. Regarding in-school consultative personnel, a majority of teachers were of the opinion that there was insufficient service;

3. Use of existing service during the 1970-71 school year broke down as follows: (a) elementary teachers used central office services most often, (b) in-school services were used most often by senior high teachers, (c) teachers between 26 and 46 years of age made most use of in-school services, and (d) teachers with more years of post-secondary training made most use of central office and in-school services;

4. Over 40 percent expected to use subject area consultation, curriculum and instructional innovation, media, and staff development services from regional offices staff;

5. Regarding the adequacy of numbers of central office personnel, 44 percent of teachers felt there were

insufficient staff development personnel, whereas, 38 percent replied that a sufficient number were available;

6. Forty-six percent were satisfied with the number of audio-visual personnel in central office;

7. It was the opinion of teachers that guidance and audio-visual services could be more effectively performed if relocated in schools;

8. Instructional areas where teachers preferred additional staff be assigned were primarily: "teaching," "Special education consultants," and "Pupil guidance and/or counselling."

SUMMARY

This chapter presented different views held by writers on the topic of supervision. The available literature indicated that although many pieces of writing do in fact look at supervision, a comprehensive theory of supervision is not available. A most recent attempt to present a theory of supervision was found in the work of Sergiovanni and Starratt (1971) who presented a humanistic approach to supervision using psychological principles which promoted the growth of the individual.

Historical themes regarding supervision were formulated by Blessing (1968), Miklos (1971), and Parsons (1972), who suggested a movement towards a consultative phase or approach in supervision.

The consultative function was described as an

on-going activity in which all professional personnel participate. In this connection, sources such as Babin (1972), Wilhelms (1970), Parsons (1972), Miklos (1971), Musella (1970), and Franseth (1965) stressed that consultation is not purely a task carried out by supervisors, but rather one which should engage directly and indirectly all of the expertise found in the school.

Much of the Canadian research has examined the extent of consultative assistance available by studying the role of selected personnel such as the department head, the principal, and the coordinator. Three conclusions dominate the Canadian literature reviewed: (1) a need exists for more consultative assistance; (2) consultative services should be provided for problems perceived by teachers; and (3) in-school personnel were seen by teachers as most effective in providing consultative assistance.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

The research methodology used in this study is provided in this chapter. A description of the instrumentation, data collection procedures, delimitations, and assumptions are presented.

INSTRUMENTATION

The Questionnaire

A three-part questionnaire (see Appendix) was designed to collect data which would obtain teachers' perceptions of consultative needs, teachers' perceptions of the personnel best able to meet these needs, and teachers' opinions on related matters.

The first part requested data including sex, total years of training, total years of teaching experience, years of teaching experience in the St. Albert Protestant Separate School District, years of teaching experience in present school, subject area assignment, consistency of assignment, grade level, and position in present school.

This was followed by 28 statements where teachers were asked to indicate "yes," "no," or "undecided," to the following question: "Would you like to have consultative assistance, available upon your request, in the following

areas?" Those respondents who selected "yes" were then requested to select the one type of personnel they would prefer to provide this assistance from the following: Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Head, District Office Staff, Department of Education Consultants, Guidance Personnel, Librarian, Another Teacher, University Personnel, and Other Resource Personnel.

The final section dealt with opinions on related matters. Teachers were asked to select one of four alternatives on the scale "agree," "disagree," "undecided," or "no opinion" for each of the seven statements.

Validity of the Instrument

In order to ensure the validity of the instrument used and that the instructions and questions were clearly stated, the questionnaire was pre-tested on three groups: (1) two members of staff in the Department of Educational Administration, The University of Alberta, (2) fourteen graduate students from the same department, and (3) District office staff of the St. Albert Protestant Separate School District.

The suggestions from each of the three groups were taken into account in the preparation of the final draft of the questionnaire. In addition, prior to the computer coding of the results, each questionnaire was individually checked to determine consistency of response, to ensure that each questionnaire was complete, and to determine if the instrument was treated seriously. On the basis of

these criteria five questionnaires were rejected.

The Structured Interview

To give additional insight to the problem studied, a structured interview (see Appendix) was designed and administered to 20 teachers. The basis of selection was as follows: when the questionnaire was administered, teachers were asked to indicate on a separate sheet of paper if they would be prepared to undergo a structured interview with the researcher. From these volunteers, four were chosen from each of the five schools involved in the study.

DATA COLLECTION

The questionnaire was administered in a group situation to the staffs of the five participating schools at the regular December (two schools) and January (three schools) staff meetings. Both investigators were present to explain the purpose of the study, to administer the questionnaire and to answer questions raised. A total number of 141 teachers answered the questionnaire. Members absent returned their completed questionnaires in the mail.

A covering letter (see Appendix) was attached to each questionnaire.

Usable returns totalled 135 questionnaires or 97 percent of the total possible. The distribution of the questionnaires by schools is given in Table 2.

Table 2

Distribution of Questionnaires

School	Distributed f	Returned f	Returned %	Used f	Used %
A	23	23	100	21	91
B	23	23	100	23	100
C	35	35	100	34	97
D	30	30	100	30	100
E	30	29	97	27	90
Total	141	140	99	135	96

[a]Five questionnaires could not be used because they were substantially incomplete.

LIMITATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The study was confined to the 141 teachers of the five schools in the St. Albert Protestant Separate School District. The questionnaire dealt with a population for statistical purposes of this study. However, it must be kept in mind that only 97 percent of the questionnaires were used. A sample of twenty teachers was chosen for the structured interview.

The instrument was valid only in as much as the data provided by the respondents were accurate. The study made the following assumptions:

1. The perception of teachers for consultative needs could be obtained through the use of a questionnaire;

2. The perception of teachers regarding personnel best able to meet the consultative needs identified could be obtained through the use of a questionnaire;

3. The respondents answered the questionnaire objectively;

4. The structured interview could objectively provide further insight to the study; and

5. The respondents understood and used the terms as defined in the study.

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESPONDENTS

Table 3 provides a summary of data concerning the personal characteristics of the participants in the study. The 135 questionnaire respondents were teachers from five

Table 3

Characteristics of Questionnaire Respondents
(N= 135)

SEX	Female 76	Male 59					
POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION	1 yr. 9	2 yrs. 12	3 yrs. 14	4 yrs. 62	5 yrs. 27	6 yrs. 11	
TEACHING EXPERIENCE	1 yr.	2 yrs.	3-4 yrs.	5-6 yrs.	7-9 yrs.	10-12 yrs.	13 yrs. +
Total	12	15	27	19	19	17	26
	1 yr.	2 yrs.	3 yrs.	4 yrs.	5 yrs.	6 yrs.	7 yrs. +
In the District	23	16	18	24	15	17	22
In present school	38	21	17	20	16	11	12
CONSISTENCY OF ASSIGNMENT WITH RESPECT TO TRAINING	Yes 122	No 13					
GRADE LEVEL	Gr. 1-6 68	Gr. 7-9 36	Gr. 10-12 26	Do not teach 5			
POSITION IN PRESENT SCHOOL	Principal 5	Assistant Principal 7	Department Head 1	Counsellor 4	Librarian 4	Classroom Teacher 114	
MAJOR SUBJECT AREA	Gr. 1-3 25	Gr. 4-6 10	Do not teach 3	Lang. Arts 23	Fine Arts 7	Math. 8	
	French 5	Science 10	Social Studies 3	Phy. Ed. 6	Home Ec. 2	Lib. Skills 3	
	Bus. Ed. 4	Sp. Ed. 3	Subject Comb.[a] 15	Ind. Arts 5	Guidance 3		

[a] These teachers indicated that they spent their teaching time equally divided between two subject area (for example, math. and science).

different schools.

Table 4 provides a summary of data concerning the personal characteristics of the participants in the structured interview. Only four members of each school participated in this aspect of the investigation.

SUMMARY

This study sought to collect data which would obtain teachers' perceptions of consultative needs, their perceptions of the personnel best able to meet these needs, and teachers' opinions on related matters.

A three-part questionnaire using a "forced choice" technique was designed. This instrument was pre-tested on three groups to ensure the validity of the instrument used. Also, individual returns were screened for completeness, internal consistency, and seriousness of response.

The questionnaires were administered in a group setting to a population of 141 teachers from the same district. Of this total, 135 questionnaires were used.

In addition, a structured interview was conducted on a sample of four teachers from each of the five schools participating in the investigation.

Table 4

Characteristics of Interview Respondents
(N= 20)

SEX	Female 9	Male 11					
POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION	1 yr. 0	2 yrs. 2	3 yrs. 1	4 yrs. 6	5 yrs. 8	6 yrs. 3	
TEACHING EXPERIENCE Total	1 yr. 1	2 yrs. 1	3-4 yrs. 3	5-6 yrs. 2	7-9 yrs. 4	10-12 yrs. 4	13 yrs. + 5
	1 yr.	2 yrs.	3 yrs.	4 yrs.	5 yrs.	6 yrs.	7 yrs. +
In the District	2	1	0	5	6	0	6
In present school	2	3	1	6	5	0	3
GRADE LEVEL	Gr. 1-6 10	Gr. 7-9 6	Gr. 10-12 4				
CONSISTENCY OF ASSIGNMENT WITH RESPECT TO TRAINING	Yes 19	No 1					
MAJOR SUBJECT AREA	Library Skills 1	Language Arts 5	Remedial Reading 1	Social Studies 1	Physical Education 1	Math./Science 1	
	Gr. 1-3 2	Gr. 4-6 1	Art 1	Math. 3	Science 3		
POSITION IN THE SCHOOL	Counsellor 2	Librarian 1	Assistant Principal 2	Classroom Teacher 15			

Chapter 4

TEACHERS' NEEDS FOR CONSULTATIVE ASSISTANCE

This chapter examines teachers' needs for consultative assistance in terms of Problem 1 which stated:

"In which consultative task areas do teachers see the greatest need for consultative assistance?"

SUB-PROBLEM 1.1

Statement. "What are teachers' opinions of the need for assistance in the consultative task areas examined?"

This study did not attempt to measure the intensity of need for consultative assistance. Rather for each of the consultative task areas, responses of "Yes," "No," and "Undecided" were obtained from teachers by the question "Would you like to have consultative assistance, available upon your request, in the following areas?"

"Information on background of students" received the highest positive response with 89 percent indicating "Yes." Two consultative task areas followed closely. An affirmative response of 86 percent was recorded for, "Assessing the need for remedial programs" and "Implementing remedial programs." Eighty-four percent felt they would like assistance in "Developing course outlines,"

whereas 50 percent replied "Yes" for "Planning lessons." "Relating information from agencies," "Experimenting with innovative methods," "Arranging for intervisitation," and "Solutions to teacher-student interaction" received an identical 82 percent "Yes" response. An eighty-one percent "Yes" response was obtained for "Selecting instructional materials" and "Recognizing cases for referral." Accordingly, in 10 out of the 28 task area statements teachers indicated a consultative need in excess of 80 percent.

As shown in Table 5, 23 task area statements received a 50 percent or better "Yes" response; on the other hand, five areas obtained a 50 percent or less response: "Parent-teacher interviews" (42 percent), "Organizing classroom research" (30 percent), "Preparing report cards" (33 percent), "Using curriculum guides" (28 percent), and "Solutions of discipline problems" (23 percent).

In only four task areas did over 50 percent of the respondents reply that no consultative assistance was required: "Preparing report cards" (59 percent), "Using curriculum guides" (57 percent), "Solutions of discipline problems" (56 percent), and "Parent-teacher interviews" (51 percent).

In particular teachers tended to be more "Undecided" in two areas: "Evaluating the teaching process" (21 percent) and "Solutions of discipline problems" (22

Table 5

Percentage Responses of Teachers' Need for Assistance in Each Consultative Task Area

Ques. No.	Consultative Task Areas (Abridged)[a]	Yes %	No %	Undecided %
18	Information on background of students	89	8	3
24	Assessing the need for remedial programs	86	10	4
25	Implementing remedial programs	86	9	5
1	Developing course outlines	84	14	2
27	Relating information from agencies	82	9	9
9	Experimenting with innovative methods	82	10	8
11	Arranging for intervisitation	82	11	7
16	Solutions to teacher-student interaction	82	13	5
4	Selecting instructional materials	81	12	7
26	Recognizing cases for referral	81	12	7
10	Using a variety of techniques	79	10	10
23	Individualizing programs	78	16	7
13	Arranging for demonstrations	76	15	9
19	Developing testing instruments	75	18	7
5	Developing teaching materials	73	13	13
12	Arranging to view programs	70	16	14

Table 5 (continued)

Ques. No.	Consultative Task Area	Yes %	No %	Undecided %
7	Using instructional aids	67	27	5
14	Observing a specific problem	65	21	14
6	Applying technology	62	21	16
15	Evaluating the teaching process	59	20	21
20	Interpreting standardized tests	59	30	12
28	Discussing personal problems	51	42	7
2	Planning lessons	50	44	7
22	Parent-teacher interviews	42	51	7
8	Organizing classroom research	39	46	15
21	Preparing report cards	33	59	8
3	Using curriculum guides	28	57	15
17	Solutions of discipline problems	23	56	22

[a] See Appendix for detailed description of consultative task areas.

percent).

Related to this aspect of the questionnaire, the study sought through interviews with 20 teachers to obtain their opinions on what they perceived as the most valuable consultative functions for them.

Table 6 provides a summary of their responses. "Informal inservice activities" were considered most valuable by 13 teachers. The types of activities that they suggested under this heading were related to most of the consultative task area statements. Task areas receiving higher responses such as: "Arranging for intervisitation," "Arranging for demonstrations," and "Arranging to view programs," would apply most closely to "Informal inservice activities." Responses related to "Meeting special student needs" were given 11 times. Other significant suggestions included "Resource services" (n=8) and "Curriculum and program development" (n=7).

The consultative needs of interviewees during the first year of teaching are provided in Table 7. The general reaction from interviewees was that they felt that little or no attempt was made to satisfy their consultative needs during their first year of teaching. Eight indicated a need for "Moral support and reassurance to increase self-confidence." Similarly, six interviewees felt a need for someone to show "Real interest in what you are doing by sharing ideas with colleagues." "Curriculum assistance" and "Obtaining practical ideas to implement in the

Table 6

Most Valuable Consultative Functions as Seen by Interviewees (N= 20)

Frequency	Functions and Specific Tasks where Applicable (f in brackets)
13	Formal Inservice Activities
	(a) On-going discussions within the district (5) (b) Meetings with other teachers in the same subject area (7) (c) Meetings between curriculum builders and classroom teachers (1)
11	Meetings Special Student Needs
	(a) Learning disabilities (2) (b) Reading problems (2) (c) Medical and family background (2) (d) Psychologist (1) (e) Teacher meeting to focus on one child (1) (f) Help with interpersonal relationships (3)
8	Resource Services
	(a) Library assistance (2) (b) "Idea-people" (5) (c) Materials specialist (1)
7	Curriculum and Program Development
	(a) For core subjects e.g., math., science, language arts, social studies (4) (b) For specialist areas e.g., art, physical education, drama, music (3)
7	Assistance with Instructional Problems
	(a) Relating to methodology (3) (b) Day-to-day problems (4)
2	Evaluation
	(a) Of programs in operation (1) (b) To give directive help (1)
2	Other
	(a) Formulating school philosophy (1) (b) Provision for meeting with parents (1)

Table 7

Needs of Interviewees during Their First Year of Teaching [a]

(N= 20)

f	List of Needs
8	Moral support and reassurance to increase self-confidence (*)
6	Real interest in what you are doing by sharing ideas with colleagues
5	Curriculum assistance
4	Obtaining practical ideas to implement in the classroom
3	Orientation to responsibilities (*)
3	Improving interpersonal relationships with students (*)
2	Interpretation of school policies and regulations (*)
2	Communication with the administration
2	Varying teaching approaches
2	Help with evaluation
2	Classroom organization and management (*)
2	Discipline (*)
1	Technical assistance
1	Diagnosis of student problems
1	Establish relationships with parents
1	Improving academic background

[a] The needs listed above were judged as generally not having been met during the first year teaching.

* In this case, one interviewee stated that this need was met through consultation.

classroom" received five and four mentions respectively.

SUB-PROBLEM 1.2

Statement. "To what extent are differences in teachers' perceptions of needs for assistance in the consultative task areas associated with:

1. Sex of the teacher;
2. Years of post-secondary education;
3. Total years of teaching experience;
4. Grade level; and
5. Position held in the school?"

To answer Sub-problem 1.2, the chi square test of independence was used with selected dependent variables against each of the consultative task areas. Data were collapsed where necessary and "Undecided" responses were removed to insure cell frequencies of more than five. Despite this attempt, classification by "Position in school" did have some cell frequencies of less than five in the category of "teacher in a designated position." In these instances, the Yates's correction for continuity (Ferguson, 1971:188) was applied. Only significant differences at the 0.05 level were reported (Table 8).

Responses Classified by Sex

Concerning responses classified by sex the following were obtained. For "Evaluating the teaching process" ($p < 0.05$), males tended to respond "Yes" more frequently than females. On the one hand 42 out 50 males

recorded "Yes", on the other, 38 out of 57 females responded positively.

A significant difference ($p < 0.05$) occurred with "Solutions to teacher-student interaction." Contrary to the results in the paragraph above, 66 out of 72 females said "Yes" while 33 out of 45 males replied affirmatively.

Nevertheless, more females recorded "No" (n=38) than "Yes" (n=31) to "Discussing personal problems" ($p < 0.01$), whereas, males tended to say "Yes" (n=38) by a margin of more than two to one ("No"=18).

Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education

In classifying responses by years of post-secondary education ("training"), significant differences were obtained in four task areas. A significant difference occurred ($p < 0.02$) with "Planning lessons." Teachers with one to three years of training tended to say "No" (n=21), more frequently than "Yes" (n=12), as opposed to those with four to six years training who were generally in favor (56 "Yes" to 38 "No").

Again a greater proportion of teachers with four to six years of training replied "Yes." Eighty-seven said "Yes" and only seven replied "No" to "Arranging for intervisitation" ($p < 0.02$). In contrast, the category of one to three years of training generally said "Yes" but by a smaller margin of 23 to 8.

Likewise, "Observing a specific problem" ($p < 0.05$) showed more perceived need for assistance by teachers with

four to six years of training. From this group 73 stated "Yes" and 18 recorded "No." In the other group the proportion was much closer. Fifteen of these teachers selected "Yes" as opposed to 10 with "No."

The pattern between the two categories prevailed with "Discussing personal problems" ($p < 0.001$), where two-thirds ($n=21$) of those with one to three years of training responded negatively. Teachers with four to six years were generally in favor with 58 out of 93 teachers stating "Yes."

Responses Classified by Total Years of Teaching Experience

Only one consultative task area revealed any significant differences ($p < 0.001$) between the four categories established on the basis of total years of teaching experience. Teachers with one, two, and five to nine years of experience replied "Yes" to "Planning lessons" by a margin of more than two to one. On the other hand, teachers with three, four and ten years or more of teaching experience answered "No" by a margin of slightly less than two to one.

However, the results obtained using the chi square test of independence were not substantiated by the views held by interview respondents. Although a majority of interviewees felt that (Table 9) the need for consultative assistance does not decrease with increased experience, 17 out of 20 teachers further stipulated that consultation is most necessary for the average teacher during the first years of teaching. Conversely, questionnaire results did

Table 8

Significant Difference Obtained Using Chi Square Test
with Selected Dependent Variables
and Task Area Statements

Ques. No.	Task Area (Abridged)	N	Response	SEX Female	SEX Male	χ^2	p
15	Evaluating the teaching process	107	Yes	38	42	4.242	0.039
			No	19	8		
16	Solutions to teacher-student interaction	128	Yes	66	33	4.470	0.034
			No	6	12		
28	Discussing personal problems	125	Yes	31	38	6.572	0.010
			No	38	18		

Table 8 (continued)

Ques. No.	Task Area (Abridged)	N	Response	POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION 1-3 yrs.	4-6 yrs.	χ^2	p
2	Planning lessons	127	Yes	12	56	5.075	0.024
			No	21	38		
11	Arranging for intervisitation	125	Yes	23	87	5.804	0.016
			No	8	7		
14	Observing a specific problem	116	Yes	15	73	4.379	0.036
			No	10	18		
28	Discussing personal problems	125	Yes	11	58	7.543	0.006
			No	21	35		

Table 8 (continued)

Ques. No.	Task Area (Abridged)	N	Response	TOTAL YEARS EXPERIENCE 1 & 2	3 & 4	5-9	10 +	χ^2	p
2	Planning lessons	126	Yes	19	9	25	14	15.631	0.001
			No	7	17	11	24		
				GRADE LEVEL Gr. 1-6	Gr. 7-9	Gr. 10-12			
2	Planning lessons	121	Yes	25	24	15		9.218	0.010
			No	38	12	7			
13	Arranging for demonstrations	118	Yes	57	23	19		6.787	0.034
			No	5	9	5			
22	Parent-teacher interviews	121	Yes	21	24	9		13.169	0.001
			No	43	10	14			

Table 8 (continued)

Ques. No.	Task Area (Abridged)	N	Response	POSITION IN SCHOOL Designated Position[a]	Classroom Teacher	χ^2	p
13	Arranging for demonstrations	123	Yes	11	92	12.077	0.001
			No	9	11		
24	Assessing the need for remedial programs	129	Yes	15	101	4.031	0.045
			No	5	3		
28	Discussing personal problems	125	Yes	17	52	6.769	0.009
			No	4	52		

[a] This includes principals, assistant principals, department head, librarians, and guidance counsellors.

not reveal any significant differences between teaching experience categories except with the task area "Planning lessons" discussed above.

Responses Classified by Grade Level

Significant differences resulted in three task areas when responses were classified by grade level. In the consultative task area of "Planning lessons" a significant difference ($p < 0.01$) was obtained. Two-thirds of the teachers at the Gr. 7-9 level and the Gr. 10-12 level replied "Yes." In contrast, 38 out of 63 teachers in Gr. 1-6 recorded a negative response.

A significant difference ($p < 0.05$) occurred in the task area of "Arranging for demonstrations." Fifty-seven out of 62 teachers in Gr. 1-6 felt that they wanted assistance available in this area. The Gr. 7-9 level also selected "Yes" over "No" but by a margin of 23 to 9. Similarily, the Gr. 10-12 level teachers were in favor with results of 19 to 5.

Gr. 7-9 teachers differed significantly ($p < 0.001$) regarding "Parent-teacher interviews." From this category, 24 out of 34 respondents stated "Yes." On the other hand, 43 out of 64 teachers from Gr. 1-6 and 14 out of 23 teachers from Gr. 10-12 responded negatively.

Responses Classified by Position in the School

Responses classified by position in the school were collapsed into two categories. The one group was made up

Table 9

Relationship Seen by Interviewees between Experience and Need for Consultative Services

(N= 20)

1. Does the need for consultative assistance decrease with increased experience ?

f	Yes (N= 9)	f	No (N= 11)
2	Yes, but not indefinitely.	4	New developments and continuing changes in curriculum require consultative assistance.
2	Yes, but it shouldn't.	3	We only think it does.
2	Yes, but it changes, i.e., it becomes "idea-sharing" for the experienced teacher.	2	With increased experience, ability to spot deficiencies increases.
1	The first year is most important.	2	Help is especially needed to improve relationships with students.
1	Because the teacher has learned to cope with problems after five years.		
1	Only after self-confidence is developed.		

Table 9 (continued)

2. In which years is the need for consultation most necessary for the average teacher ?

f	
8	First few or beginning years.
3	First year.
3	First year or the start of a new course and/or program.
3	First two years.
2	Need isn't related to experience.
1	After many years of experience.

3. f	Elaboration
3	Had nobody to turn to in first year but needed someone very much.
3	Some teachers get in a "rut" with increasing years of experience.
2	The type of consultation changes, but need doesn't disappear.
2	Complexity of the teaching role demands constant communication.
1	Curriculum guides are not useful enough.

of all the teachers assigned regular classroom duties, the other group consisted of teachers in a designated position. These included the principals, the assistant principals, the department head, the librarians, and the guidance counsellors. Teachers in a designated position were found to have significant differences of opinion with classroom teachers in three consultative task areas.

The task area of "Arranging for demonstrations" ($p < 0.001$) showed a significant difference between the two groups. Ninety-two out of 93 classroom teachers said "Yes," whereas, 11 out of 20 in a designated position felt that they would like this type of assistance.

In the same fashion, "Assessing the need for remedial programs" obtained a difference in opinion ($p < 0.05$). Classroom teachers favored this assistance more strongly (101 out of 109) as opposed to the teachers in a designated position (15 out of 20).

However, the consultative task area "Discussing personal problems" ($p < 0.01$) showed a greater difference. Seventeen out of 21 teachers in a designated position responded "Yes"; on the other hand, the classroom teachers were divided with 52 recording "Yes" and 52 replying "No."

SUB-PROBLEM 1.3

Statement. "Do teachers' perceptions of the need for consultative assistance differ in the task areas teachers consider most important on the basis of:

1. Grade level and years of post-secondary education;

2. Years of post-secondary education and total years of teaching experience; and

3. Grade level and total years of teaching experience?"

Responses Classified by Grade Level and Years of Post-Secondary Education

The classification of responses by grade level and years of post-secondary education suggested that teachers in Gr. 1-6 with three years of training or less tended to perceive a greater need for assistance in the task areas examined. Table 10 provides the data for this classification.

Developing course outlines. Teachers in Gr. 1-6 and with two years training replied with a significantly higher "Yes" response (75 percent) than other post-secondary education categories in the task area of "Developing course outlines." Not much difference existed in the other two grade level categories. Minor exceptions showed 36 percent of teachers with six years of training in Gr. 10-12 and 37 percent of teachers with five years of training in Gr. 7-9 who stated "Yes."

Information on background of students. In the task area "Information on background of students," teachers in Gr. 1-6 with one, two, and three years of post-secondary

education tended to indicate a greater need for assistance with percentages of 67, 75, and 58 respectively. On the other hand, teachers with four, five, or six years gave a "Yes" percentage response of 42, 34, and 9.

Assessing the need for remedial programs. Teachers in Gr. 1-6 with one and two years of post-secondary education recorded the highest "Yes" response in the task area "Assessing the need for remedial programs" with 78 and 75 percent. Other education categories indicated 50, 40, 26 and 9 percent at this grade level.

Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education and Total Years of Teaching Experience

Teachers with four years of post-secondary education with one, two, five and six years of teaching experience tended to give higher positive responses than did other experience categories when classified on the basis of years of post-secondary education and total years of teaching experience.

Developing course outlines. With regard to "Developing course outlines," teachers with four years of post-secondary education and one year (67 percent), two years (58 percent), five and six years (53 percent) of teaching experience expressed a higher "Yes" response than other experience categories with 37, 41, 18, and 31 percent respectively. Also, a 21 percent response by teachers with two years of post-secondary education and seven to nine

Table 10

Selection of Most Important Task Areas for Teachers Classified by Grade Level and Years of Post-Secondary Education [a]
(N= 135)

Task Areas	Q.1 Developing Course Outlines							Q.18 Information on Background of Students							Q.24 Assessing the Need for Remedial Programs						
GRADE LEVEL	YEARS POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION																				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
YES	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
D.n.t.[b]	0	0	0	0	2	27	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	2	0	0	0	0	2	27	3
Gr. 1-6	45	75	43	45	26	18	41	67	75	58	42	34	9	44	78	75	50	40	26	9	41
Gr. 7-9	11	0	14	27	37	18	24	11	0	14	29	35	18	24	11	0	22	31	37	19	28
Gr.10-12	11	0	14	16	15	36	16	11	8	14	19	22	27	19	11	8	14	16	15	27	16
Total %	67	75	71	90	78	100	84	89	83	86	92	93	72	89	100	83	86	89	80	82	88
NO																					
D.n.t.	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	7	2	4	9	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	1
Gr. 1-6	33	8	22	2	11	0	8	0	17	7	2	0	0	5	0	17	7	2	4	9	5
Gr. 7-9	0	0	7	5	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	1
Gr.10-12	0	0	0	2	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	3
Total %	33	8	29	9	22	0	14	0	17	14	4	4	18	8	0	17	7	6	15	18	10
% Undecided	0	17	0	3	0	0	2	11	0	0	4	3		3	0	0	7	5	5	0	2

[a] Total for each column in tables 9-11 is 100 percent.

[b] Do not teach.

years of experience was substantially higher than any other experience category.

Information on background of students. Again, teachers with four years of post-secondary education and one year (59 percent), two years (60 percent), five and six years (58 percent) of teaching experience replied with a higher"Yes" response than other experience categories to the task area "Information on background of students."

Assessing the need for remedial programs. Teachers with ten or more years of teaching experience tended to have a lower percentage "Yes" response at the four-year level of post-secondary education than other experience categories in the task area "Assessing the need for remedial programs."

Responses Classified by Grade Level and Total Years of Teaching Experience

Teachers with 13 or more years of teaching experience at the Gr. 1-6 level tended to have a higher "Yes" response when results were classified by grade level and total years of teaching experience in the three task areas examined. Table 12 provides the data for this classification.

Developing course outlines. A 50 percent response for teachers at the Gr. 7-9 level with one year of teaching experience was much higher than the other experience

Table 11

Selection of Most Important Task Areas for Teachers Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education and Total of Teaching Experience

(N= 135)

Task Areas	Q.1 Developing Course Outlines								Q.18 Information on Background of Students								Q.24 Assessing the Need for Remedial Programs							
YRS. OF POST.-SEC. ED.	TOTAL YEARS EXPERIENCE																							
	1	2	3-4	5-6	7-9	10-12	13+	Total	1	2	3-4	5-6	7-9	10-12	13+	Total	1	2	3-4	5-6	7-9	10-12	13+	Total
YES	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
One	0	13	0	0	0	6	11	4	0	13	0	0	0	18	12	6	0	13	0	0	0	17	15	7
Two	8	0	7	0	21	12	0	7	8	0	7	5	16	11	4	8	8	0	6	0	21	12	4	7
Three	0	8	11	0	11	6	11	7	0	7	11	5	11	11	12	9	0	8	11	5	11	12	12	9
Four	67	58	37	53	41	18	31	41	59	60	44	58	37	18	31	42	59	53	44	48	42	17	31	41
Five	17	13	19	16	11	12	19	16	17	13	22	16	16	18	22	19	8	13	18	16	16	12	18	16
Six	0	0	4	16	11	18	0	9	0	0	4	16	5	6	8	16	0	0	4	16	5	12	8	7
% Total	92	92	78	85	95	71	80	84	84	93	88	100	85	82	88	90	75	87	84	85	95	82	88	87
NO																								
One	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Two	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	1
Three	0	0	0	5	0	12	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	1
Four	0	8	11	0	0	0	4	4	0	7	4	0	0	0	4	2	0	13	4	5	0	0	0	3
Five	8	0	7	0	5	5	4	4	8	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	17	0	4	0	0	6	0	3
Six	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	0	1
% Total	8	8	18	10	5	29	16	14	8	7	12	0	10	12	8	6	17	13	12	10	5	18	0	9
% Undecided	0	0	4	5	0	0	4	2	8	0	0	0	5	6	4	4	8	0	4	5	0	0	12	4

categories which ranged from 12 to 33 percent in the area of "Developing course outlines." Teachers with 7-9 and 13 or more years of teaching experience at the grade one to six level recorded a 53 and 58 percent "Yes" response as opposed to a 26 to 41 percent range for other experience categories at this grade level.

Information on background of students. The task area "Information on background of students" showed that teachers with 13 or more years of teaching experience and at the Gr. 1-6 level had a 64 percent "Yes" response. Other experience categories recorded affirmative responses ranging from 34 to 48 percent.

Assessing the need for remedial programs. As in the area "Developing course outlines," teachers with 7-9 and 13 or more years of teaching experience had a higher "Yes" response (58 and 60 percent) as opposed to a range of 20 to 41 for other experience categories in the task area "Assessing the need for remedial programs."

SUMMARY

This chapter has examined teachers' responses to Problem 1 which sought to determine what are teachers' opinions of needs for assistance according to various consultative task areas given.

Teachers showed the greatest need in 10 consultative task area statements receiving an 80 percent or better

Table 12

Selection of Most Important Task Areas for Teachers Classified by Grade Level and Total Years of Teaching Experience

(N= 135)

Task Areas	Q.1 Developing Course Outlines								Q.18 Information on Background of Students								Q.24 Assessing the Need for Remedial Programs							
	TOTAL YEARS EXPERIENCE																							
GRADE LEVEL	1	2	3-4	5-6	7-9	10-12	13+	Total	1	2	3-4	5-6	7-9	10-12	13+	Total	1	2	3-4	5-6	7-9	10-12	13+	Total
YES	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
D.n.t.	0	0	4	5	0	5	4	3	0	0	4	5	0	0	4	3	0	0	4	5	0	5	4	3
Gr. 1-6	34	33	41	26	53	35	58	41	34	33	37	37	48	40	64	44	26	20	37	32	58	41	60	41
Gr. 7-9	50	33	22	32	16	18	12	24	42	33	30	32	16	24	8	24	50	40	25	32	16	24	12	26
Grades 10-12	8	26	11	21	26	12	8	16	8	26	19	26	21	18	12	19	0	27	19	16	24	12	12	16
% Total	92	92	78	84	95	70	80	84	84	92	90	100	85	82	80	90	76	87	85	85	95	82	88	86
NO																								
D.n.t.	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Gr. 1-6	0	0	7	11	5	18	12	8	0	0	10	0	5	12	4	5	0	13	7	5	0	12	0	5
Gr. 7-9	0	8	7	0	0	6	0	3	0	8	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1
Grades 10-12	0	0	4	0	0	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	8	0	0	5	5	6	0	3
% Total	0	8	18	11	5	30	16	14	8	8	10	0	10	12	8	8	16	13	11	10	5	18	0	10
% Unde-cided	0	0	4	5	0	0	4	2	8	0	0	0	5	6	4	2	8	0	4	5	0	0	12	4

"Yes" response. The four highest task areas were as follows: "Information on background of students" (89 percent); "Assessing the need for remedial programs" (86 percent); "Implementing remedial programs (86 percent); and "Developing course outlines (84 percent).

Using the chi square test of independence, it was found that differences in teachers' perceptions of the need for assistance in certain consultative task areas were associated with selected dependent variables. With regard to the sex of the teacher, males tended to respond "Yes" more frequently than females in the task areas "Evaluating the teaching process" and "Discussing personal problems," whereas, the reverse occurred with "Solutions to teacher-student interaction." A greater proportion of teachers with four to six years of training replied affirmatively than teachers with one to three years of training to the task areas "Planning lessons," "Arranging for intervisitation," "Observing a specific problem," and "Discussing personal problems." Teachers with one, two, and five to nine years of experience responded favorably to "Planning lessons" as opposed to teachers with three, four, and ten years or more of teaching experience. When results were classified by grade level, two-thirds of the teachers at the Gr. 7-9 level and the Gr. 10-12 replied "Yes," however, a majority of teachers from Gr. 1-6 were not in favor of assistance involving "Planning lessons." Also the latter group recorded by a significantly greater margin "Yes" to

the task area "Arranging for demonstrations." Regarding "Parent-teacher interviews" Gr. 7-9 teachers stated "Yes," however, a majority of Gr. 1-6 and Gr. 10-12 teachers responded negatively. With the task areas "Arranging for demonstrations" and "Assessing the need for remedial programs," classifications on the basis of position in the school showed that classroom teachers were more in favor of such assistance than teachers in a designated position. The reverse occurred with "Discussing personal problems" where a higher proportion of teachers in a designated position responded positively when compared to the responses from the category of classroom teachers.

Classifications using grade level, years of post-secondary education, and total years of teaching experience, with each other in the consultative task areas teachers considered most important did not produce any significant differences.

Chapter 5

TEACHERS' SELECTION OF CONSULTATIVE PERSONNEL

The responses of the participants to Problem 2 are examined in this chapter. Problem 2 stated:

"Which type of personnel do teachers perceive as being best able to meet their consultative needs?"

SUB-PROBLEM 2.1

Statement. "What are teachers' perceptions of the personnel best able to meet their needs for assistance in each of the consultative task areas?"

On the basis of individual consultative task areas, principals and guidance personnel were selected as a first source of assistance in nine and eight task areas respectively. Table 13 provides a ranking of the three classes of personnel selected most frequently as a source of assistance in each consultative task area. This approach was limited in that teachers could select only one category of consultative personnel from a list of ten categories given.

Principal. In 9 out of 28 consultative task areas, principals were selected as a first source of assistance. Fifty-eight percent of those responding "Yes" to "Parent-teacher interview" chose the principal as the personnel

they perceived as best meeting this consultative need. Other task areas with corresponding percentages were as follows: "Solutions of discipline problems" (36 percent), "Arranging to view programs" (36 percent), "Preparing report cards" (36 percent), "Discussing personal problems" (36 percent), "Arranging for demonstrations" (34 percent), "Arranging for intervisitation" (33 percent), "Evaluating the teaching process" (33 percent), and "Observing a specific problem" (24 percent). With the exception of "Arranging for intervisitation," all of the above received a positive response of 80 percent or less. In short, although principals were viewed as a first source in nine areas, only one was in a task area considered most important to the respondents.

Principals were selected as a second choice in the following two task areas: "Information on background of students" (11 percent) and "Solutions to teacher-student interaction" (16 percent).

Librarian. Librarians were selected as a first source of assistance in three task areas: "Using instructional aids" (57 percent), "Organizing classroom research" (45 percent), and "Selecting instructional materials" (35 percent). Librarians were not chosen as a second choice in any task area.

Other resource personnel. Other resource personnel were identified as a first choice in only one consultative

task area. Twenty-eight percent of teachers selected other resource personnel in the task area of "Applying technology to the classroom."

In addition, this type of personnel was selected as a second choice in eight areas: "Recognizing cases for referral" (5 percent), "Relating information from agencies" (7 percent), "Assessing the need for remedial programs" (10 percent), and "Implementing remedial programs" (10 percent).

Guidance personnel. Teachers chose guidance personnel as a first source of assistance in eight consultative task areas. The percentage response to these areas were as follows: "Recognizing cases for referral" (84 percent), "Information on background of students" (82 percent), "Relating information from agencies" (78 percent), "Interpreting standardized tests" (68 percent), "Solutions to teacher-student interaction" (57 percent), "Developing testing instruments" (48 percent), "Assessing the need for remedial programs" (46 percent) and "Implementing remedial programs" (35 percent). With the exception of "Interpreting standardized tests," all of the above task areas received a 75 percent or more "Yes" response.

In addition, guidance personnel were selected as a second source of assistance for "Solutions of discipline problems" (22 percent).

Department head. Teachers felt that department

heads should be a first source of assistance in two areas. "Developing course outlines" received a 35 percent response and 33 percent was recorded in the task area of "Individualizing programs."

As a second choice, more consultative task areas were recognized: "Arranging for demonstrations" (21 percent), "Arranging for intervisitation" (25 percent), "Evaluating the teaching process" (20 percent), "Organizing classroom research" (19 percent), "Selecting instructional materials" (18 percent), "Planning lessons" (22 percent), "Interpreting standardized tests" (8 percent), "Developing teaching materials" (15 percent), "Using a variety of techniques" (15 percent), and "Using curriculum guides" (16 percent).

Another teacher. Teachers chose another teacher in three areas: "Planning lessons" (51 percent), "Developing teaching materials" (36 percent), and "Using a variety of techniques" (29 percent).

As a second choice the following were identified: "Parent-teacher interviews" (14 percent), "Preparing report cards" (27 percent), "Discussing personal problems" (22 percent), "Using instructional aids" (17 percent), "Developing course outlines" (22 percent), "Individualizing programs" (15 percent), and "Experimenting with methods" (24 percent).

University personnel. In the area of "Experimenting

Table 13

Ranking of Three Classes of Personnel Selected Most Frequently as a Source of Assistance in Each Consultative Task Area

Ques. No.	Consultative Task Area (Abridged)	Yes Response (N= 135)	First Three Choices	% Response
22	Parent-teacher interviews	57	Principal	58
			Another Teacher	14
			Assistant Principal	11
17	Solutions of discipline problems	31	Principal	36
			Guidance Personnel	22
			Assistant Principal	10
12	Arranging to view programs	94	Principal	36
			District Office Staff	28
			Department Head	17
21	Preparing report cards	44	Principal	36
			Another Teacher	27
			Other Resource Personnel	11
28	Discussing personal problems	69	Principal	36
			Another Teacher	22
			Other Resource Personnel	16
13	Arranging for demonstrations	103	Principal	34
			Department Head	21
			District Office Staff	17

Table 13 (continued)

Ques. No.	Consultative Task Area (Abridged)	Yes Response (N= 135)	First Three Choice	% Response
11	Arranging for intervisitation	110	Principal	33
			Department Head	25
			District Office Staff	20
15	Evaluating the teaching process	80	Principal	33
			Department Head	20
			Another Teacher	19
14	Observing a specific problem	88	Principal	24
			Department Head	21
			Another Teacher	18
7	Using instructional aids	91	Librarian	57
			Another Teacher	17
			Other Resource Personnel	13
8	Organizing classroom research	53	Librarian	45
			Department Head	19
			Another Teacher	15
4	Selecting instructional materials	109	Librarian	35
			Department Head	18
			Other Resource Personnel	12
6	Applying technology to the classroom	83	Other Resource Personnel	28
			University Personnel	19
			Librarian	17

Table 13 (continued)

Ques. No.	Consultative Task Area (Abridged)	Yes Response (N= 135)	First Three Choices	% Response
26	Recognizing cases for referral	109	Guidance Personnel	84
			Other Resource Personnel	5
			University Personnel	5
18	Information on background of students	120	Guidance Personnel	82
			Principal	11
			Another Teacher	3
27	Relating information from agencies	111	Guidance Personnel	78
			Other Resource Personnel	7
			Department Head	5
			Principal	5
20	Interpreting standardized tests	79	Guidance Personnel	68
			University Personnel	8
			District Office Staff	8
			Department Head	8
16	Solutions to teacher-student interaction	110	Guidance Personnel	57
			Principal	16
			Other Resource Personnel	8
19	Developing testing instruments	101	Guidance Personnel	48
			University Personnel	19
			Department of Ed. Consultants	14
24	Assessing the need for remedial programs	116	Guidance Personnel	46
			Other Resource Personnel	10
			Department Head	10

Table 13 (continued)

Ques. No.	Consultative Task Area (Abridged)	Yes Response (N= 135)	First Three Choices	% Response
25	Implementing remedial programs	116	Guidance Personnel	35
			Other Resource Personnel	10
			University Personnel	15
1	Developing course outlines	113	Department Head	35
			Another Teacher	22
			Department of Ed. Consultants	18
23	Individualizing programs	105	Department Head	33
			Another Teacher	15
			Department of Ed. Consultants	13
2	Planning lessons	67	Another Teacher	51
			Department Head	22
			University Personnel	10
5	Developing teaching materials	99	Another Teacher	36
			Department Head	15
			University Personnel	12
10	Using a variety of techniques	107	Another Teacher	29
			Department Head	15
			University Personnel	16
9	Experimenting with methods	110	University Personnel	25
			Another Teacher	24
			Department Head	15
3	Using curriculum guides	38	Department of Ed. Consultants	45
			Department Head	16
			Another Teacher	13

with methods," university personnel were selected as a first source of assistance with a teacher response of 25 percent.

Teachers selected university personnel as a second choice in the following instances: "Applying technology to the classroom" (19 percent), "Interpreting standardized tests" (8 percent), and "Developing testing instruments" (19 percent).

Department of Education consultants. In the task area "Using curriculum guides" Department of Education consultants received a 45 percent response. Department of Education consultants did not occur as a second choice in any area.

Assistant principal. Assistant principals did not obtain a first or second ranking for any consultative task area.

District office staff. Although this category was not selected by teachers as a first choice, District office staff occurred as a second choice in two areas. They were as follows: "Arranging to view programs" (28 percent) and "Interpreting standardized tests" (8 percent).

SUB-PROBLEM 2.2

Statement. "Which personnel do teachers feel are best able to meet their needs for consultative assistance

in the following grouped task areas:

1. Curriculum and Program Development;
2. Instructional Materials;
3. Methodology and Instructional Techniques;
4. Student Measurement and Evaluation;
5. Meeting Specific Student Needs; and
6. Other Areas?"

The department head was seen by teachers as best able to meet needs for consultative assistance in the grouped task area "Curriculum and Program Development." Respondents selected librarians as best able to meet the needs for assistance with "Instructional Materials." Needs in the area of "Methodology and Instructional Techniques" were perceived as best being met by another teacher. For the task areas grouped under "Student Measurement and Evaluation" and "Meeting Specific Student Needs," guidance personnel were ranked as a first choice. Teachers felt that principals were best able to meet needs in "Other Areas." Table 14 provides for a frequency distribution for all personnel in grouped task areas. Table 15 follows with a ranking of the three highest personnel selected as a source of assistance by grouped task areas.

Curriculum and Program Development

Four task areas were placed under the heading of "Curriculum and Program Development"; namely, "Developing course outlines," "Arranging to view programs," "Planning

lessons," and "Using curriculum guides." Twenty-five percent of teachers felt that the department heads were best able to meet consultative needs in this grouped task area and 23 percent chose another teacher. This was followed by Department of Education consultants with 14 percent. Principals received a 13 percent response.

Instructional Materials

"Selecting instructional materials," "Developing teaching materials," "Using instructional aids," and "Applying technology" were included under the heading "Instructional Materials." The librarian received a 30 percent response in this group. Another teacher recorded 20 percent, whereas, other resource personnel and department heads obtained 14 and 13 percent respectively.

Methodology and Instructional Techniques

"Methodology and Instructional Techniques" included "Experimenting with methods," "Using a variety of techniques," "Observing a specific problem," and "Evaluating the teaching process." Another teacher ranked as a first choice with a 23 percent response. Secondly, 19 percent of teachers selected department heads. Thirdly, principals received a 16 percent response.

Student Measurement and Evaluation

"Assessing the need for remedial programs," Developing testing instruments," "Interpreting standardized

Table 14

Personnel Selected as a Source of Assistance To Meet Consultative Needs in Grouped Task Areas
(N= 135)

Ques. No.	GROUPED TASK AREAS (Abridged)	CONSULTATIVE PERSONNEL: Assistant Principal	Department Head	Guidance Personnel	Librarian	Another Teacher	District Office Staff	Dept. of Ed. Consultants	University Personnel	Other Resource Personnel	Principal	Total
	A. Curriculum and Program Development	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
1	Developing course outlines	2	40	0	2	25	5	20	8	7	4	113
12	Arranging to view programs	11	16	0	0	7	26	0	0	0	34	94
2	Planning lessons	0	15	0	1	34	1	6	7	3	0	67
3	Using curriculum guides	2	6	0	1	5	1	17	2	1	3	38
	Total	15	77	0	4	71	33	43	17	11	41	312
	%	5	25	0	1	23	11	14	5	4	13	100
	B. Instructional Materials											
4	Selecting instructional materials	0	20	0	38	19	5	8	3	13	3	109
5	Developing teaching materials	0	15	0	10	36	6	10	12	7	3	99
7	Using instructional aids	0	7	0	52	15	0	1	3	12	1	91
6	Applying technology	1	9	0	14	8	2	7	16	23	3	83
	Total	1	51	0	114	78	13	26	34	51	10	382
	%	0	13	0	30	20	3	7	9	14	3	100

Table 14 (continued)

Ques. No.	GROUPED TASK AREAS (Abridged)	CONSULTATIVE PERSONNEL: Assistant Principal	Department Head	Guidance Personnel	Librarian	Another Teacher	District Office Staff	Dept. of Ed. Consultants	University Personnel	Other Resource Personnel	Principal	Total
	C. Methodology and Instructional Techniques	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
9	Experimenting with methods	0	16	1	1	26	8	10	27	12	9	110
10	Using a variety of techniques	2	24	2	0	31	5	12	17	7	7	107
14	Observing a specific problem	3	18	2	1	16	7	11	7	2	21	88
15	Evaluating the teaching process	3	16	2	1	15	7	4	4	2	26	80
	Total	8	74	7	3	88	27	37	55	23	63	385
	%	2	19	2	1	23	7	10	14	6	16	100
	D. Student Measurement and Evaluation											
24	Assessing the need for remedial programs	2	12	53	0	4	10	5	7	12	11	116
19	Developing testing instruments	0	4	48	0	4	4	14	19	5	3	101
20	Interpreting standardized tests	1	6	54	0	3	6	3	6	0	0	79
22	Parent-teacher interviews	6	3	4	0	8	0	0	1	2	33	57
	Total	12	29	161	0	31	22	22	33	24	63	397
	%	3	7	41	0	7	6	6	8	6	16	100

Table 14 (continued)

Ques. No.	GROUPED TASK AREAS (Abridged)	CONSULTATIVE PERSONNEL: Assistant Principal	Department Head	Guidance Personnel	Librarian	Another Teacher	District Office Staff	Dept. of Ed. Consultants	University Personnel	Other Resource Personnel	Principal	Total
	E. Meeting Specific Student Needs	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	f
18	Information on backgrounds of students	2	0	98	0	4	0	0	0	3	13	120
25	Implementing remedial programs	4	10	41	0	4	14	5	10	17	11	116
27	Relating information from agencies	0	5	87	0	0	2	3	1	8	5	111
26	Recognizing cases for referral	0	2	92	1	0	2	0	2	5	5	109
23	Individualizing programs	0	35	13	1	16	7	14	9	5	5	105
	Total	6	52	331	2	24	25	22	22	38	39	561
	%	1	9	59	0	4	5	4	4	7	7	100
	F. Other Areas											
11	Arranging for intervisitations	6	27	0	0	13	22	4	1	1	36	110
16	Solutions to tea.-stud. interaction	5	3	63	0	6	5	1	9	0	18	110
13	Arranging for demonstrations	10	22	0	0	15	17	1	2	1	35	103
28	Discussing personal problems	1	2	7	0	15	4	1	3	11	25	69
8	Organizing classroom research	0	10	3	24	8	0	1	4	3	0	53
17	Solutions of discipline problems	3	1	7	0	1	1	1	1	0	16	31
	Total	25	65	80	24	58	49	9	20	16	130	476
	%	5	14	17	5	12	10	2	4	3	28	100

tests" and "Parent-teacher interviews" were placed under the heading "Student Measurement and Evaluation." Guidance personnel were selected as a first choice with a 41 percent response. Principals followed with a 16 percent response. The remaining percentage response was divided fairly evenly among the various personnel.

Meeting Specific Student Needs

The category "Meeting Specific Student Needs" included: "Information on background of students," "Implementing remedial programs," "Relating information from agencies," "Recognizing cases for referral" and "Individualizing programs."

This grouping was again dominated by guidance personnel who received 59 percent of the total response. The remaining personnel all recorded less than ten percent.

Other Areas

Six areas were assigned to the residual grouping "Other Areas": "Arranging for intervisitation," "Solutions to teacher-student interaction," "Arranging for demonstrations," "Discussing personal problems," "Organizing classroom research," and "Solutions of discipline problems."

On this basis, the principal with a 28 percent response was selected as a first choice. Guidance personnel with 17 percent and department heads with 14 percent were ranked second and third.

Table 15 [a]

Ranking of Three Highest Personnel Selected as a Source of Assistance by Grouped Task Areas

Area of Assistance	N	First choice	%	Second choice	%	Third choice	%
A. Curriculum and Program Development	312	Department Head	25	Another Teacher	23	Department of Ed. Consultants	14
B. Instructional Materials	382	Librarian	30	Another Teacher	20	Other Resource Personnel	14
C. Methodology and Instructional Techniques	385	Another Teacher	23	Department Head	19	Principal	16
D. Student Measurement and Evaluation	397	Guidance Personnel	41	Principal	16	University Personnel	8
E. Meeting Specific and Evaluation	397	Guidance Personnel	59	Department Head	9	Principal	7
F. Other Areas	476	Principal	28	Guidance Personnel	17	Department Head	14

[a] See Table 14 for classification of all personnel.

SUB-PROBLEM 2.3

Statement. "What are the responses of teachers to each category of personnel as a source of assistance?"

Table 16 provides the data used to investigate Sub-problem 2.3. This Sub-problem was concerned with the total response (N=2513) to all personnel for the 20 consultative task areas. On this basis, guidance personnel clearly ranked first with a 23 percent response (n=579).

An identical 14 percent response occurred for another teacher (n=350), the department heads (n=348), and the principals (n=346).

The remaining personnel received much lower total responses. University personnel with seven percent (n=181) were ranked fifth. Next, District office staff (n=169) and other resource personnel (n=167) followed closely with the same total percentage response as university personnel.

Department of Education consultants (n=159) and librarians (n=147) were eight and ninth respectively with a six percent response.

Consultative assistance from teachers indicated little perceived need for assistant principals with a total response of three percent (n=67).

SUMMARY

This chapter investigated teacher responses to the type of personnel teachers perceived as being best able to

Table 16

Ranking of Total Response to Each Category of Personnel as a Source of Assistance

Personnel	Total Response by Personnel (N= 2513)	% of Total Response	Rank [a]
Guidance	579	23	1
Another Teacher	350	14	2
Department Head	348	14	3
Principal	346	14	4
University Personnel	181	7	5
District Office Staff	169	7	6
Other Resource Personnel	167	7	7
Department of Education Consultants	159	6	8
Librarian	147	6	9
Assistant Principal	67	3	10

[a] Ranking was based on percentage.

meet their consultative needs.

Personnel were selected as a first source of assistance for the following number of consultative task areas: principals (nine), guidance personnel (eight), librarians (three), another teacher (three), department heads (two), university personnel (one), Department of Education consultants (one), and other resource personnel (one).

For each of the grouped task areas that follow, personnel selected as a first choice are found in brackets: "Curriculum and Program Development" (department heads); "Instructional Materials" (librarians); "Methodology and Instructional Techniques" (another teacher); "Student Measurement and Evaluation" (guidance personnel); "Meeting Specific Student Needs" (guidance personnel); and "Other Areas" (principals).

When the total response to each category of personnel as a source of assistance was examined, guidance personnel ranked first with a 23 percent response. Three types of consultative personnel followed with a total response of 14 percent; namely, another teacher, department heads, and principals.

Chapter 6

OTHER MATTERS RELATED TO CONSULTATION

This chapter examines teachers' opinions with regard to released time (Problem 3) and to other matters related to consultation (Problem 4). Additional data gathered from the interviews and the questionnaires are incorporated in the form of tables and discussed where applicable.

PROBLEM 3

Statement. "What opinions do teachers hold with regard to released time for selected consultative personnel?"

Table 17 provides the background data necessary to discuss Sub-problems 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3. Generally teachers felt that department heads should be given more released time, but not at the expense of released time for assistant principals. Furthermore, respondents favored releasing teachers of recognized ability on a scheduled basis to provide consultative help.

Sub-problem 3.1

Statement. "Do teachers feel that more released time for consultation should be given to department heads?"

Seventy-three percent of teachers agreed that department heads should be given more released time for

consultation. Only four percent disagreed, whereas, 13 percent were "Undecided" and 10 percent indicated "No opinion."

Sub-problem 3.2

Statement. "Do teachers feel that, if released time for department heads were made available, it should be at the expense of released time for assistant principals?"

Although 49 percent of the respondents disagreed that if released time for department heads were made available it should be at the expense of released time for assistant principals, 21 percent remained "Undecided." Nineteen percent agreed with the statement and 10 percent expressed no opinion.

Sub-problem 3.3

Statement. "Do teachers feel that teachers of recognized ability, who are not in any designated administrative position, should be released on a scheduled basis to provide consultative help?"

The majority of teachers (74 percent) were in favor of giving teachers of recognized ability, who are not in any designated administrative position, released time on a scheduled basis to provide consultative help. The remaining 26 percent were divided as follows: 13 percent "Disagree," 10 percent "Undecided," and 3 percent "No opinion."

Table 17

Percentage Distribution of Opinions of Respondents on Matters Related to Consultative Needs

Ques. No.	Statement	Agree %	Disagree %	Undecided %	No Opinion %
1.	Department Heads/Subject Area Coordinators should be given more released time for consultation.	73	4	13	10
2.	If this time for Department Heads/Subject Area Coordinators were made available, it should be at the expense of released time for Assistant Principals.	19	49	21	12
3.	Assistant Principals should act as consultants for most subject areas.	21	58	16	5
4.	Principals should spend more time in consultation with teachers.	65	13	16	7
5.	Staff development meetings should be held mostly in the school where you teach rather than in another location.	63	15	13	10
6.	University staff can fill certain needs in consultative services.	84	6	7	3
7.	Teachers of recognized ability, who are not in any designated administrative position, should be released on a scheduled basis to provide consultative help.	74	13	10	3

The interview respondents substantiated these results in their reactions to the question: "Would you be in favor of the practice of giving selected teachers, because of their preparation and experience, certain consultative assignments without these being called 'promotions' or 'administration positions' as such?" The interviewer further qualified the question by adding that this person would be given released time for this function, but no additional salary would be given over and above the teacher's salary. Sixty-five percent of the interviewees responded "Yes," 30 percent stated "No," and 5 percent were "Undecided." Nine of the 13 respondents who replied "Yes" elaborated upon their response in these ways:

1. "Time must be made available" (4);
2. "A flexible person must be selected" (2);
3. "Selection should be based on the ideas this person has and could give" (1);
4. "Teachers must be freed to consult this person" (1); and
5. "Ideally this person should be paid additional renumeration" (1).

In connection with #5, five out of the six teachers who stated "No" to giving selected teachers certain consultative assignments indicated that they were not opposed to the concept but rather they felt very strongly that if teachers are to be recognized for special abilities, they should be financially compensated for additional

services. In short, 18 out of 20 of the interviewees felt that certain consultative assignments could be given to teachers selected on the basis of their preparation and experience provided the qualifications discussed above were met.

Sub-problem 3.4

Statement. "To what extent are differences in opinion regarding released time for selected consultative personnel associated with:

1. Sex of the teacher;
2. Years of post-secondary education;
3. Total years of teaching experience;
4. Grade level ; and
5. Position held in the school?"

To answer Sub-problem 3.4 the chi square test of independence was used with the dependent variable listed above and the questionnaire responses to matters concerning released time for department heads (Tables 18 and 19) and teachers of recognized ability (Table 20). Significant differences at the 0.05 level were associated with the variables sex of the teacher and position in the school.

Sex of the teacher. With regard to "Released time for Department Heads should be at the expense of released time for Assistant Principals," (Table 19) a significant difference associated with the sex of the teacher was

obtained ($p < 0.05$). Males tended to disagree more (34 out of 41) than did females (32 out of 50) with the statement given.

Years of post-secondary education. No significant differences at the 0.05 level were associated with years of post-secondary education. A slightly higher proportion of teachers (74 out of 76) in the category of four to six years agreed that "Department Heads should be given more released time for consultation" (Table 18). Of the 28 teachers with one to three years of post-secondary education, 25 agreed with the statement.

Total years of teaching experience. Again results showed no significant differences between the four categories based on total years of teaching experience. However, to the statement "Released time for Department Heads should be at the expense of released time for Assistant Principals," teachers in the category of five to nine years tended to disagree more strongly (19 out of 22) than any other experience categories.

Grade level. No significant differences associated with grade level were obtained. But, to the statement "Department Heads should be given more released time for consultation," 5 out of 50 teachers at the Gr. 1-6 level disagreed. However, none of the teachers from the Gr. 7-9 and the Gr. 10-12 levels disagreed with the same statement.

Position in the school.- Significant differences ($p < 0.01$) associated with position in the school occurred with the statement: "Released time for Department Heads should be at the expense of released time for Assistant Principals." All 19 teachers in a designated position disagreed with the statement. However, 25 out of 72 classroom teachers agreed. Perhaps this would indicate a greater appreciation for the role of the assistant principal on the part of teachers in a designated position as opposed to a contrary view held by some regular classroom teachers.

PROBLEM 4

Statement. "What opinions do teachers hold on other matters related to consultation?"

This section generally found that: (1) assistant principals are not perceived as consultants for subject areas: (2) principals should spend more time in consultation with teachers; and (3) university staff can fill certain consultative needs. The investigation also revealed teachers' opinions regarding where staff development meetings should take place and the type of approach that should be used. The statistical results for Sub-problems 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 are found in Table 17.

Sub-problem 4.1

Statement. "Do teachers feel that assistant

Table 18

Test of Independence Concerning Whether Department Heads Should Be Given More Released Time for Consultation

(N= 104)

Variables	Categories	Agree	Disagree	χ^2	p
SEX OF THE TEACHER	Female	53	4	0.489	0.484
	Male	46	1		
POST-SEC. EDUCATION	1-3 yrs.	25	3	1.422	0.233
	4-6 yrs.	74	2		
TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE	1&2 yrs.	18	1	1.121	0.772
	3&4 yrs.	21	2		
	5-9 yrs.	27	1		
	10 yrs.	33	1		
GRADE LEVEL[a]	Gr. 1-6	45	5	5.161	0.076
	Gr. 7-9	28	0		
	Gr. 10-12	21	0		
POSITION IN SCHOOL	Designated Position	18	0	0.196	0.658
	Classroom Teacher	81	5		

[a] N= 99

Table 19

Test of Independence Concerning Whether Released Time for Department Heads Should be at the Expense of Released Time for Assistant Principals

(N= 91)

Variables	Categories	Agree	Disagree	χ^2	p
SEX OF THE TEACHER	Female	18	32	4.050	0.044
	Male	7	34		
POST-SEC. EDUCATION	1-3 yrs.	5	19	0.721	0.396
	4-6 yrs.	20	47		
TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE	1&2 yrs.	7	10	3.781	0.286
	3&4 yrs.	5	13		
	5-9 yrs.	3	19		
	10 yrs. +	10	24		
GRADE LEVEL [a]	Gr. 1-6	16	31	1.443	0.486
	Gr. 7-9	5	16		
	Gr. 10-12	4	15		
POSITION IN SCHOOL	Designated Position	0	19	9.096	0.003
	Classroom Teacher	25	47		

[a] N= 87

Table 20

Test of Independence Concerning Whether Classroom Teachers of Recognized Ability Should Be Released To Provide Consultative Help

(N= 118)

Variables	Categories	Agree	Disagree	χ^2	p
SEX OF THE TEACHER	Female	57	10	0.013	0.909
	Male	43	8		
POST-SEC. EDUCATION	1-3 yrs.	26	7	1.258	0.262
	4-6 yrs.	74	11		
TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE	1&2 yrs.	15	5	2.170	0.538
	3&4 yrs.	23	3		
	5-9 yrs.	31	4		
	10 yrs. +	31	6		
GRADE LEVEL [a]	Gr. 1-6	50	9	1.424	0.491
	Gr. 7-9	24	6		
	Gr. 10-12	22	2		
POSITION IN SCHOOL	Designated Position	15	3	0.031	0.861
	Classroom Teacher	85	15		

[a] N= 113

principals should act as consultants for most subject areas?"

Teachers generally disagreed (58 percent) that assistant principals should act as consultants for most subject areas. Only 21 percent of the respondents agreed, 16 percent were "Undecided," and 5 percent voiced "No opinion."

Sub-problem 4.2

Statement. "Do teachers feel that principals should spend more time in consultation with teachers?"

A majority of respondents (65 percent) felt that principals should spend more time in consultation with teachers, whereas, 13 percent disagreed, 16 percent responded "Undecided," and 7 percent held "No opinion."

Sub-problem 4.3

Statement. "Do teachers feel that university staff can fill certain needs in consultative services?"

Teachers responded with the highest percentage of agreement in this area. Eighty-four percent of the respondents agreed that university staff can fill certain needs in consultative services. Only six percent disagreed with the statement.

This point of view is reinforced by additional comments written on the questionnaire. Four out of 18 teachers who gave additional opinions indicated that "More

liaison would be useful between university personnel and the school" (Table 26).

Three interviewees (Table 27) felt that "Help should come from various sources such as university personnel, conferences, and institutes."

Sub-problem 4.4

Statement. "Do teachers feel that staff development meetings should be held mostly in the school where they teach rather than in another location?"

Teachers felt (63 percent "Agree") that staff development meetings should be held mostly in the school where they teach rather than in another location. Of the remaining respondents 15 percent disagreed, 13 percent were "Undecided" and 10 percent had "No opinion."

In addition to questionnaire results regarding this matter, interviewee opinions were obtained to determine which approach would best serve their needs in consultative areas (Table 21). In the area of curriculum development, "the small group session" (40 percent) and a combination of "discussion with another person" and "the small group session" (35 percent) proved most desirable. To handle needs associated with instructional improvement, 35 percent preferred "discussion with another person," and 40 percent favored a combination of "discussion with another person" and "a small group session." Technical assistance was seen as best being met by "discussion with another person" (35

percent). In the area of meeting pupil needs, 50 percent chose a combination of "discussion with another person" and "the small group session."

Sub-problem 4.5

Statement. "To what extent are differences in teachers' perceptions on consultative matters examined in Problem 4 associated with:

1. Sex of the teacher;
2. Years of post-secondary education;
3. Total years of teaching experience;
4. Grade level; and
5. Position held in the school?"

The chi square test of independence was used with the statements dealing with other matters related to consultation examined in Problem 4 (Tables 21-24). Only one significant difference ($p < 0.05$) was associated with the dependent variables examined. Concerning the statement "Staff development meetings should be held mostly in the school where you teach rather than in another location," teachers with ten years or more of teaching experience agreed most strongly.

Sex of the teacher. No significant differences ($p \leq 0.05$) were associated with the sex of the teacher. However, with regard to the statement "Staff development meetings should be held mostly in the school where you teach

Table 21

Approach Selected by Interviewees Best Serving Their Needs in Consultative Areas
(N= 20)

Approach	Curriculum Development %	Instructional Improvement %	Technical Assistance %	Meeting Pupil Needs %
(1) Discussion with another person	5	35	55	25
(2) Small group session	40	5	5	15
(3) Large group session	0	0	0	0
(4) (1) and (2)	35	40	15	50
(5) (1) and (3)	0	0	5	0
(6) (2) and (3)	5	10	10	0
(7) (1), and (2) and (3)	15	10	10	10
(8) Uncertain	0	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100	100

rather than in another location," (Table 24) females (15 out of 63) tended to disagree by a greater margin than males (5 out of 37). Similarly, 7 out of 69 females disagreed that "University staff can fill certain needs in consultative services," whereas, only one male out of 52 disagreed.

Years of post-secondary education. Again, no significant differences associated with years of post-secondary education were obtained. An examination of the results showed that a higher proportion of teachers with four to six years of training (84 out of 87) agreed that "University staff can fill certain needs in consultative services" (Table 25) as opposed to 29 out of 34 teachers in the one to six year category who replied "Agree."

Total years of teaching experience. A significant difference ($p < 0.01$) using the chi square was obtained with the dependent variable total years of teaching experience. The test of independence with the statement "Staff development meetings should be held mostly in the school you teach rather than in another location" (Table 24) revealed that teachers with 10 years or more of teaching experience agreed most strongly (34 out of 35). The three other experience categories recorded results similiar to one another. These responses totalled 51 "agree" and 19 "disagree."

Grade level. No statistically significant differences were associated with the variable grade level. However, teachers at the Gr. 1-6 level tended to agree more strongly (48 out of 53) than Gr. 7-9 (23 out of 30) and Gr. 10-12 (14 out of 19) teachers with the statement "Principals should spend more time in consultation with teachers" (Table 23). Concerning the statement "Staff development meetings should be held mostly in the school you teach rather than in another location" a higher proportion of Gr. 1-6 teachers (46 out of 55) and Gr. 7-9 teachers (24 out of 28) replied "Agree." Only 11 out of 18 Gr. 10-12 teachers agreed with the statement (Table 24). Another result also worth reporting, occurred with the statement "University staff can fill certain needs in consultative services" (Table 25). Although only 1 out of 52 teachers from the Gr. 7-9 and Gr. 10-12 levels disagreed, 7 out of 64 Gr. 7-9 teachers recorded "Disagree."

Position in the school. Again, no significant differences were associated with position in the school. However, to the statement "Assistant Principals should act as consultants for most subject areas" (Table 22) classroom teachers tended to agree less frequently (21 out of 90). On the other hand, the majority of teachers in a designated position also disagreed, but 7 out of 16 teachers did in fact agree. With regard to "Principals should spend more time in consultation with teachers" (Table 23), all 19

teachers in a designated position agreed, whereas, 69 out of 86 classroom teachers were in agreement with the statement.

SUMMARY

This chapter looked at teachers' opinions with regard to released time and to other matters related to consultation as stated in Problem 3 and 4.

Concerning released time for selected consultative personnel, 73 percent of teachers felt that time for consultation should be given to department heads, but 49 percent disagreed that this time should come at the expense of released time for assistant principals. A majority of teachers (74 percent) were in favor of giving teachers of recognized ability released time to provide consultative help. This position was supported by interview respondents.

Only 21 percent of teachers chose assistant principals as consultants for most subject areas. However, 65 percent of teachers felt that principals should spend more time in consultation with teachers. Furthermore, 84 percent of the respondents were of the opinion that university staff could fill certain needs in consultative services. Finally, 63 percent of the teachers felt that staff development meetings should be held mostly in the school where they teach.

Using the chi square test of independence, three

Table 22

Test of Independence Concerning Whether Assistant Principals Should Act as Consultants for Most Subject Areas

(N= 106)

Variables	Categories	Agree	Disagree	χ^2	p
SEX OF THE TEACHER	Female	15	42	0.001	0.980
	Male	13	36		
POST-SEC. EDUCATION	1-3 yrs.	7	19	0.005	0.946
	4-6 yrs.	21	59		
TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE	1&2 yrs.	4	18	2.625	0.453
	3&4 yrs.	6	17		
	5-9 yrs.	7	24		
	10 yrs. +	11	19		
GRADE LEVEL [a]	Gr. 1-6	16	37	3.804	0.149
	Gr. 7-9	7	19		
	Gr. 10-12	2	20		
POSITION IN SCHOOL	Designated Position	7	9	1.958	0.162
	Classroom Teacher	21	69		

[a] N= 101

Table 23

Test of Independence Concerning Whether Principals Should Spend More Time in Consultation with Teachers

(N= 105)

Variables	Categories	Agree	Disagree	χ^2	p
SEX OF THE TEACHER	Female	46	10	0.246	0.620
	Male	42	7		
POST-SEC. EDUCATION	1-3 yrs.	20	7	1.665	0.197
	4-6 yrs.	68	10		
TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE	1&2 yrs.	13	5	4.264	0.234
	3&4 yrs.	20	1		
	5-9 yrs.	26	4		
	10 yrs. +	29	7		
GRADE LEVEL [a]	Gr. 1-6	48	5	4.230	0.121
	Gr. 7-9	23	7		
	Gr. 10-12	14	5		
POSITION IN SCHOOL	Designated Position	19	0	3.143	0.076
	Classroom Teacher	69	17		

[a] N= 102

Table 24

Test of Independence Concerning Whether Staff Development Meetings Should Be Held Mostly in each Individual School

(N= 105)

Variables	Categories	Agree	Disagree	χ^2	p
SEX OF THE TEACHER	Female	48	15	2.316	0.128
	Male	37	5		
POST-SEC. EDUCATION	1-3 yrs.	25	8	0.842	0.359
	4-6 yrs.	60	12		
TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE	1&2 yrs.	15	7	10.604	0.014
	3&4 yrs.	18	4		
	5-9 yrs.	18	8		
	10 yrs. +	34	1		
GRADE LEVEL [a]	Gr. 1-6	46	9	5.075	0.079
	Gr. 7-9	24	4		
	Gr. 10-12	11	7		
POSITION IN SCHOOL	Designated Position	15	2	0.248	0.619
	Classroom Teacher	70	18		

[a] N= 101

Table 25

Test of Independence Concerning Whether University Staff Can Fill Certain Needs in Consultative Services

(N= 121)

Variables	Categories	Agree	Disagree	χ^2	p
SEX OF THE TEACHER	Female	62	7	2.051	0.152
	Male	51	1		
POST-SEC. EDUCATION	1-3 yrs.	29	5	3.360	0.067
	4-6 yrs.	84	3		
TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE	1&2 yrs.	24	0	5.158	0.161
	3&4 yrs.	18	3		
	5-9 yrs.	34	1		
	10 yrs. +	37	4		
GRADE LEVEL [a]	Gr. 1-6	57	7	3.938	0.140
	Gr. 7-9	30	1		
	Gr. 10-12	22	0		
POSITION IN SCHOOL	Designated Position	20	0	0.656	0.418
	Classroom Teacher	93	8		

[a] N= 117

significant ($p \leq 0.05$) results were found to be associated with the variables examined. With regard to the statement "Released time for Department Heads should be at the expense of released time for Assistant Principals" significant differences relating to sex of the teacher and to position in the school were obtained (Problem 3). In the first test males tended to disagree more than females, in the latter teachers in a designated position showed much stronger disagreement than classroom teachers. When the statement "Staff development meetings should be held mostly in the school you teach rather than in another location" was examined, teachers with 10 years or more of teaching experience agreed more strongly than the other three experience categories (Problem 4).

Table 26

Summary of Additional Comments in the Questionnaire
(N= 18)

f	Comments
9	Classroom teachers should be given more released time to consult with resource people and/or attend meetings.
4	More liaison would be useful between university personnel and the school.
4	The area of pupil relationships requires assistance.
3	There is a need for department heads in language arts and fine arts.
3	There should be more inservice meetings for teachers in the same subject area.
3	Other resources such as publishing companies and industry could be useful.
2	The suggestion of using teachers of recognized ability is very important.
2	Help is needed to develop new programs and assess new materials.
1	Librarians are used extensiverly.
1	Assistance is needed for first year teachers.
1	We need someone to turn to regarding legal problems involving teaching.
1	A concentration of consultants in reading would be most valuable.
1	Problems can be overcome by one's initiative.
1	Help is needed to develop long-term goals in education.

Table 27

Additional Comments Gathered from Interviewees

(N= 20)

f	Comments
8	A need exists for more practical training (i.e., internship) in the B.Ed. program.
5	Teachers must be given released time to take advantage of consultative services.
4	Teachers often work too independently because they are afraid of revealing inadequacies.
3	The establishment of subject coordinators or department heads would be of much value.
3	Help should come from various sources such as university personnel, conference, institutes.
3	More help must be given to first year teachers (i.e., use of support or "buddy" teachers).
2	A basic aim of consultation should be personal growth.
2	The closer the consultative services are to the teachers the more useful they are to them.

Table 27 (continued)

(N= 20)

f	Comments
1	The extent of consultation depends greatly on the philosophy of the school.
1	The more consultative services are available, the better the interaction among the staff.
1	The principal should not be expected to provide consultative assistance.
1	An audio-visual course should be compulsory for all teachers.
1	A reading course should be compulsory for all teachers.
1	The appointment of consultative personnel, at the expense of loading classrooms, would be detrimental to possible benefits.
1	Consultation depends too much on the person from whom the assistance is coming.
1	In Alberta, there is too much reliance on the expert.

Chapter 7

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter includes an outline of the research methodology used, a restatement of the problem examined, and a presentation of the problems investigated. In addition, this chapter discusses various conclusions and implications of the study in light of recent Canadian research studies on consultation and blends in some of the personal views held by this researcher.

Research Methodology

A questionnaire was administered to the 141 teachers of the St. Albert Protestant Separate School District at their monthly staff meetings. Usable returns totalled 135 questionnaires (97 percent). In addition, four teachers from each of the five schools participated in a structured interview.

Percentage frequency distributions were obtained for all items. Furthermore, the chi square test of independence was used with all questionnaire items against five selected dependent variables.

Summary of the Findings

The major findings are presented in terms of each of the research problems which were divided into further

sub-problems.

Statement of Problem 1. "What are teachers' opinions of the need for assistance in the consultative task areas examined?" Eighty percent or more of the teachers indicated that they would like consultative assistance in 10 out of the 28 consultative task area statements. The four highest task areas were as follows: "Information on background of students" (89 percent); "Assessing the need for remedial programs" (86 percent); "Implementing remedial programs" (86 percent); and "Developing course outlines" (84 percent).

Significant differences in teachers' perceptions of the need for assistance were obtained in various consultative tasks areas. These were associated with the dependent variables that follow:

1. The variable, sex of the teacher, indicated that males tended to show more need for assistance in "Evaluating the teaching process" and "Discussing personal problems." On the contrary females responded more affirmatively to "Solutions to teacher-student interaction."

2. With regard to years of post-secondary education, teachers with less training (one to three years) perceived less need for assistance than teachers with four to six years of education in the following task areas: "Planning lessons," "Arranging for intervisitation,"

"Observing a specific problems," and "Discussing personal problems."

3. Teachers with one, two, five to nine years of teaching experience indicated by a margin of two to one, a need for assistance in the area of "Planning lessons." On the other hand, teachers with three, four and ten or more years of teaching experience tended to respond negatively to the same task area. The lack of a significant difference between the categories was not in keeping with the views held by the interviewees who felt that there was a greater need for consultative assistance in the beginning years of teaching.

4. Grade level differences were found in three areas. The majority of Gr. 1-6 teachers opposed assistance in "Planning lessons," whereas, two-thirds of the teachers from Gr. 7-9 and Gr. 10-12 were in favor of such assistance. Teachers from Gr. 1-6 supported, by a substantial margin, the necessity for assistance in "Arranging for demonstrations." Although teachers from Gr. 7-9 tended to show need for consultative assistance with "Parent-teachers interviews," the majority of teachers from Gr. 1-6 and Gr. 10-12 rejected this area.

5. Differences relating to position in the school were observed in three task areas. Classroom teachers responded "Yes" by large margins in "Arranging for demonstrations" and "Assessing the need for remedial programs." On the other hand, a substantial majority (17

out of 21) in a designated position favored assistance with "Discussing personal problems," whereas, opinions of classroom teachers were divided on this task area statement.

Teachers' perceptions on the basis of classifications using various dependent variables with each other did not produce any dominant generalizations in the consultative task areas teachers considered most important.

Statement of Problem 2. "Which type of personnel do teachers perceive as being best able to meet their consultative needs?" Teachers indicated on the basis of responses to each individual task area that principals and guidance personnel were the consultative personnel most able to meet their needs for assistance.

When related task areas were grouped under appropriate headings, the following categories of personnel were selected as a first choice by teachers: "Curriculum and Program Development" (department heads, 25 percent); "Instructional Materials" (librarians, 30 percent); "Methodology and Instructional Techniques" (another teacher, 23 percent); "Student Measurement and Evaluation" (guidance personnel, 41 percent); "Meeting Specific Student Needs" (guidance personnel, 59 percent); and "Other Areas" (principals, 28 percent).

With a 23 percent total response, guidance personnel led all consultative personnel categories in

total response. Another teacher, department head, and principals followed with a response of 14 percent each.

Statement of Problem 3. "What opinions do teachers hold with regard to released time for selected consultative personnel?" Seventy-three percent of teachers agreed that department heads should be given more released time for consultation. However, 49 percent of the respondents disagreed that this released time should come at the expense of released time for assistant principals.

A majority of teachers (74 percent) were in favor of giving teachers of recognized ability, who are not in any designated administrative position, released time on a scheduled basis to provide consultative help. Interview respondents also substantiated this position with 90 percent favoring this idea given certain qualifications.

Only two significant differences in opinion using a test of independence were obtained regarding released time for selected consultative personnel. Both occurred with the statement "Released time for Department Heads should be at the expense of released time for Assistant Principals." A greater proportion of males as opposed to females disagreed with the statement. Significantly all 19 teachers in a designated position disagreed with the statement, whereas, 25 out of 72 classroom teachers were in agreement.

Statement of Problem 4. "What opinions do teachers hold on other matters related to consultation?" Teachers (58 percent) indicated that assistant principals should not act as consultants for most subject areas. However, a majority of respondents (65 percent) felt that principals should spend more time in consultation with teachers. Interestingly, 84 percent agreed that university staff can fill certain needs in consultative services.

A majority of teachers (63 percent) felt that staff development meetings should be held mostly in the school where they teach rather than in another location.

On matters examined in Problem 4, the chi square test of independance showed that differences in teachers' perceptions were significantly ($p<0.01$) associated with the dependent variable total years of teaching experience. Teachers in the category 10 or more years of teaching experience agreed most strongly with the statement "Staff development meetings should be held mostly in the school you teach rather than in another location."

Conclusions and Implications

The work of McGillivray (1966), Milne (1968), and Humphreys (1970) indicated a serious need for help for beginning teachers. Little significant difference was found in this study associated with beginning teachers using a test of independence with each of the task area statements. However, interview respondents emphasized a

great need for consultative help to be readily available during their beginning years of teaching.

Holdaway (1971b:40) indicated that often principals cannot give consultative help of a specialist nature, but "They can however do much with regard to providing a supportive, facilitating and motivating climate." The teachers participating in this study not only felt that principals should spend more time in consultation with them, but chose the principal as a first source of assistance in the task areas "Arranging to view programs," "Arranging for demonstrations," and "Arranging for intervisitation." This would lend itself well to Holdaway's (1971b) conclusion.

With support from such studies as Hewko (1965), Heron (1969), Cowle (1971) and Parsons (1971), Haughey (1972:27) concluded ". . . that in-school personnel are most influential and effective in terms of consultative assistance." Her own study also added further evidence to the studies she lists. Although this study did not attempt to address itself to this problem, indications are that Haughey's contention seems to apply. For example in the areas of: "Curriculum and Program Development," "Instructional Materials," "Methodology and Instructional Techniques," and "Other Areas," in-school types of staff such as department heads, another teacher, librarians, and principals were clearly first and second choices. In addition, teachers felt that teachers of recognized

ability should be given released time for consultative tasks.

Respondents in this study strongly indicated that the assistant principal is not perceived as a consultative type of personnel in the task areas examined. This raises questions about the role of the assistant principal which could be examined in further studies. However, this study recognizes that real limitations existed in using a "forced-choice" approach where only one category of personnel could be selected for each task area. Respondents could argue that they had difficulty in divorcing the roles of principals and the assistant principals with regard to consultative services. Or again, given two selections assistant principals might have recorded a higher response.

This study reaffirmed the consultative role of guidance personnel in schools. When the consultative task areas were grouped under the headings of "Student Measurement and Evaluation" and "Meeting Specific Needs of Students," guidance personnel were favored by large margins as a first choice over any other type of personnel.

As stated by Haughey (1972) and others, "outside" personnel such as university personnel, District office staff, Department of Education consultants, and other resource personnel did not dominate any particular grouped consultative task areas in this study. However, teachers felt in the interviews and recorded in the questionnaire

a desire to have more liaison with university personnel. As a suggestion in this regard, school boards who do not have the financial resources to provide consultative personnel for all specialist areas could retain university personnel for specific assignments relating to in-service activities.

Up to this point, this analysis has primarily dealt with views related to consultative personnel per se. This study must not lose sight of the research question dealt with in Problem 1, namely, the areas in which teachers would like consultative assistance. This investigation has shown substantial need for consultative services in the areas of program development, methodology, and meeting student needs. In the course of this study, teachers stated during informal discussions, on the questionnaire, and in the interviews, that they felt that teachers must be asked what their needs were as opposed to being told what they were by their administrative staff. Following this approach, efforts should be made to provide consultative help in the areas where teachers express a need.

Suggestions for Further Research

A study such as this not only presents useful research data but often serves as a starting point for new directions and/or questions in social science research. With this perspective in mind, some possible suggestions

for further study are as follows:

1. Broaden the study to include other school jurisdictions.

2. Perform a follow-up study specifically to question the individuals participating in this study regarding responses.

3. Examine the consultative help given by personnel who have replaced the position of assistant principal in certain Alberta schools since 1971.

4. Continue efforts to examine the consultative role of various personnel examined in this study.

5. Using various school settings, research the type and amount of consultative assistance that exists between regular classroom teachers.

6. Measure the intensity of need for consultative services.

7. Continue to examine from the teachers' perspective their needs for consultative assistance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Babin, Patrick
1970 "Supervisors Look at Themselves." McGill Journal of Education, 5:173-177.

1972 "The Supervisor's Role in Individualizing Instruction." The Educational Courier, 42:18-21.

Blessing, Kenneth
1968 The Role of the Resource Consultant in Special Education. The Council for Exceptional Children, National Education Association.

Born, Warren G., ed.
1971 Supervision and the Teacher: The Odd Couple. Papers presented at the New York State Association of Foreign Languages Teachers Colloquin, New York.

Chapman, Robin James
1972 "The Nature and Role of Regional Offices of Education in the Province of Alberta." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Clarke, Audrey May
1969 "The Department Head in the High Schools of Alberta." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Cowle, Walter
1971 "The Role of the Field Consultant in Elementary Schools." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Duboyce, Raymond Arthur
1970 "A Longititudinal Study of Administrative Ratios in the Edmonton Public School District." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Enns, Frederick
1968a "The Supervisor and His Function." The Council on School Administration Bulletin. (Alberta), 7:3-23.

1968b "Supervision of Instruction: A Conceptual Framework." Canadian Education and Research Digest, September: 283-297.

Ferguson, George A.
1966 Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Formanek, Scott Clarence
1965 "An Investigation of the Assistance Received by Beginning Elementary School Teachers in the Calgary Public School System." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Franseth, Jane
1965 Supervision in Rural Schools: A Report on Beliefs and Practices. Office of Education, Bureau of Educational Research and Development, Washington, D.C.

Gray, Douglas Andrew
1972 "The Role of the Department Head in Ottawa High Schools." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Gregory, David MacLeod
1972 "Staffing Ratios in Schools." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Hamilton, William L.
1966 "An Analysis of North American Ideas on School Administration." The Council on School Administration Bulletin (Alberta), 5:3-24.

Harris, Ben M.
1963 Supervisory Behavior in Education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Harrison, Reid Edwards
1965 "An Analysis of the Weekly Work Load of Nova Scotia High School Principals." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Haughey, Margaret Logan
1972 "Opinions of Teachers in Alberta Concerning Staffing Practices." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Heron, Robert Peter
1969 "Innovativeness, School Climate and Coordinators." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Hewko, Walter M.
1965 "An Analysis of the Role of the Junior High Coordinator." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Holdaway, Edward A.
1971a "Staffing Metropolitan School Districts." The Canadian Administrator, April, 1971.

1971b "Research Into Consultation." Paper presented at the Canadian Education Association Short Course, Banff, Alberta.

Hrynyk, Nick L.
1963 "Supervisory Needs: West Jasper Place Public Schools." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Humphreys, Edward H.
1970 "Schools in Change." A Survey for The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Leeper, Robert R., ed.
1969 Changing Supervision for Changing Times. Addresses for the Twenty-fourth Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois.

Lepatski, William
1970 "Staffing Ratios and Costs in Metropolitan School Systems in Western Canada." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Lindermann, Bertram C.
1970 "Teacher Evaluation: Barrier to Communication?" Educational Leadership, 28:207-208.

Lucio, William H. (ed.)
1969 The Supervisor: New Demands, New Dimensions. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association.

MacKay, David Allister
1969 "Canadian Supervisory Practices." The Canadian Administrator, 9:9-14.

1971 "An Analysis of Supervisory Functions." Paper presented at the Canadian Education Association Short Course, Banff, Alberta.

McGillivray, William Russell
1966 "A Survey of Supervisory Assistance as Perceived by Beginning Teachers in Selected Urban High Schools in Ontario." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

McLoughlin, Roy I.
1972 "The Supervisor of Instruction." Journal of the Supervisors of Instruction, 1:14-18.

Miklos, Erwin
1971 "Consultation." Paper presented at the Canadian Education Association Short Course, Banff, Alberta.

1971 "Alternative Approaches to Supervision and Consultation." Paper presented at the Canadian Education Association Short Course, Banff, Alberta.

Milne, John Leslie
1968 "Problems of First Year Teachers In An Urban School System." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Morin, Lloyd Henry
1964 "The Principal's Perception of His Role." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Musella, Donald
1970 "Teacher Development as a Means to the Improvement of Instruction: The Role of the Principal." Principals' Journal, 10:9-21.

Neagley, Ross Linn and N. Dean Evans
1970 Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Ogletree, James R.
1972 "Changing Supervision in a Changing Era." Educational Leadership, 29: 507-510.

Parsons, G. Llewellyn
1971 "Teacher Perceptions of Supervisory Effectiveness." The Canadian Administrator, 11:5-8.

1972 "Stages in the Evolution of Educational Supervision." The National Teachers Association Journal, 63:30-35.

Pitsula, Michael
1966 "An Analysis of the Role of Supervisory Assistants in Large Administrative Units in Saskatchewan." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Ratsoy, Eugene William
1970 "Characteristics and Instructional Practices of Alberta Teachers in 1968-1969." Edmonton: The Alberta Advisory Committee on Educational Studies.

Reiderer, L.A.
1965 "A Time Study of Educational Supervision and Administration of Urban School Districts of Saskatchewan." Canadian Educational and Research Digest, 5:40-7.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Robert J. Starratt
1971 Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Shipp, William Paul
1970 "The Development of a Theory of Humanistic Educational Supervision." Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, U.S.A.

Snelgrove, Vernon Joshua
1965 "A Study of the Administrative Role of the District Supervising Inspector in Newfoundland." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Stewart, Bob R.
1970 "Supervisory Behavior." Educational Leadership, 27:521-525.

Uhlman, Charles Clarence
1966 "An Analysis of The Expectations of School Board Members for the Role of Supervising Principal in Nova Scotia." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Wetter, Wesley James
1965 "The Role of the Elementary School Principal as Defined by Parents in Selected Attendance Areas." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Wilhelms, Fred I.
1970 "The Delicate Art Called Supervision." The Headmaster, Fall:39-41.

Wiles, Kimball
1967 Supervision for Better Schools. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Wilson, L. Craig, T. Madeson Byar, A.S. Shapero, and S.H. Schell
1969 Sociology of Supervision, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Young, J.E.M.
1967 "A Survey of Teachers' Attitudes Towards Certain Aspects of Their Profession." Canadian Education and Research Digest, June: 112-129.

Ziolkowski, Erwin Harold
1965 "A Study of Practices Employed by High School Principals in the Supervision of Instruction." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.

APPENDIX

INSTRUMENTS USED FOR DATA COLLECTION

and

Table 28

KEY TO ABRIDGED TASK AREA STATEMENTS

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON 7, CANADA

December 7, 1972

I am requesting your participation in this research study on consultation which Mr. Gish, your Superintendent, has approved after discussion with the principals.

This study is being conducted, in large part, by Mr. Jacques Plamondon who will use the data for his M. Ed. Thesis. Although the study is being limited to educators in the St. Albert Separate School District, it is hoped that the results will have general applicability and benefit.

The major purposes of this study are:

1. To discover teachers' needs for consultative assistance;

2. To determine which personnel are perceived by teachers as being best able to meet these needs.

All information relating to individuals will be confidential.

A report containing compilations for all schools will be sent to each principal.

Your co-operation is very much appreciated.

E.A. Holdaway

E.A. Holdaway
Associate Professor

vt

QUESTIONNAIRE - CONSULTATIVE NEEDS OF TEACHERS

(Questionnaire designed by Dr. E.A. Holdaway and Mr. J.L. Plamondon, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Alberta)

PERSONAL DATA

Please answer each item as it applies to you in your present teaching position by placing a check mark (✓) in the space provided.

1. Sex. (1) ___ Female (2) ___ Male

2. Number of Complete Years of Post-Secondary Education (as assessed for salary purposes).

   ___ 1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5 ___ 6 or more

3. Number of Years of Teaching Experience (including the current year as a full year).

   (a) Total ___
   (b) In St. Albert Protestant Separate School District ___
   (c) In your present school ___

4. Subject Area (check the ONE area where you spend the greatest percentage of teaching time).

   (1) ___ Do not teach
   (2) ___ Teaching all or most subjects to Gr. 1-2-3
   (3) ___ Teaching all or most subjects to Gr. 4-5-6
   (4) ___ Fine Arts (e.g., Art, Music, Drama)
   (5) ___ French
   (6) ___ English
   (7) ___ Mathematics
   (8) ___ Science
   (9) ___ Language Arts
   (10) ___ Physical Education
   (11) ___ Industrial Arts
   (12) ___ Home Economics
   (13) ___ Guidance
   (14) ___ Social Studies
   (15) ___ Business Education
   (16) ___ Special Education
   (17) ___ Other (specify) . . . . . .

5. Is your teaching assignment generally consistent with your academic preparation?

   (1) ___ Yes (2) ___ No

6. In which ONE of these grade levels do you spend the greatest percentage of your instructional time?

   (1) ___ Do not teach (2) ___ K-Gr. 3 (3) ___ Gr. 4-6
   (4) ___ Gr. 7-9 (5) ___ Gr. 10-12

7. Position in your present school.

   (1) ___ Principal
   (2) ___ Assistant Principal
   (3) ___ Department Head/Subject Coordinator
   (4) ___ Counsellor
   (5) ___ Librarian
   (6) ___ Classroom Teacher

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Circle the number in the first column which best corresponds to your opinion regarding each statement as follows:

   1 - Yes
   2 - No
   3 - Undecided

2. If you answer "Yes" to a particular statement, then you are asked to indicate in the second column the ONE type of personnel you would prefer to provide this assistance:

   0 - Principal.
   1 - Assistant Principal.
   2 - Department Head (includes subject coordinator).
   3 - Guidance Personnel (Supervisor of Guidance or guidance counsellor).
   4 - Librarian.
   5 - Another Teacher (from either your school or another school).
   6 - District Office Staff (Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent).
   7 - Department of Education Consultants, either head office or regional office.
   8 - University Personnel (e.g., academic staff, graduate students, research assistants, faculty consultants).
   9 - Other Resource Personnel (e.g., Alberta Guidance Clinic, industry, business services, private practitioners).

3. If you answer "No" or "Undecided" go on to the next statement and do not circle a number in the second column.

WOULD YOU LIKE TO HAVE CONSULTATIVE ASSISTANCE, AVAILABLE UPON YOUR REQUEST, IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS?	Your opinion			Who would you prefer to provide this assistance?									
	Yes	No	Undecided	Principal	Assistant Principal	Department Head	Guidance Personnel	Librarian	Another Teacher	District Office Staff	Dept. of Ed. Consultants	University Personnel	Other Resource Personnel
1. Developing course outlines.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2. Planning lessons and lesson units.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3. Using Department of Education curriculum guides.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4. Selecting instructional and resource materials.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5. Developing teaching materials.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6. Applying technology to the classroom.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7. Using instructional aids (e.g., films, transparencies, charts, kits).	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8. Organizing your classroom research.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
9. Experimenting with innovative methods.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10. Using a variety of instructional techniques and approaches.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11. Making arrangements to consult teachers from other schools on instructional practices.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

WOULD YOU LIKE TO HAVE CONSULTATIVE ASSISTANCE, AVAILABLE UPON YOUR REQUEST, IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS?	Your opinion			Who would you prefer to provide this assistance?									
	Yes	No	Undecided	Principal	Assistant Principal	Department Head	Guidance Personnel	Librarian	Another Teacher	District Office Staff	Dept. of Ed. Consultants	University Personnel	Other Resource Personnel
12. Arranging classroom visits within District to view program implementation.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
13. Making arrangements to observe demonstrations by other teachers of certain techniques.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14. Observing and evaluating your teaching to help with a specific problem in teaching methodology.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15. Observing and evaluating the teaching process in your classroom.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
16. Finding solutions to problems related to teacher-student interaction.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
17. Becoming less dependent on other staff for solutions of discipline problems.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
18. Obtaining information on background of specific students.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
19. Developing instruments to measure pupil performance.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

WOULD YOU LIKE TO HAVE CONSULTATIVE ASSISTANCE, AVAILABLE UPON YOUR REQUEST, IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS?	Your opinion			Who would you prefer to provide this assistance?										
	Yes	No	Undecided	Principal	Assistant Principal	Department Head	Guidance Personnel	Librarian	Another Teacher	District Office Staff	Dept. of Ed. Consultants	University Personnel	Other Resource Personnel
20. Giving and interpreting standardized tests.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
21. Preparing pupil report cards.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
22. Planning and conducting parent-teacher interviews.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
23. Individualizing programs to meet student needs.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
24. Assessing the need for remedial programs to overcome student weaknesses (e.g., learning disabilities).	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
25. Implementing remedial programs to overcome acknowledged student weaknesses (e.g., speech therapy).	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
26. Recognizing potential cases for referral to outside agencies.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
27. Relating information from outside agencies (e.g., Alberta Guidance Clinic reports) to the classroom situation.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
28. Discussing your personal problems which you feel may be adversely affecting your teaching.	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Please add additional areas where you feel that consultative assistance would be of benefit.

OPINIONS ON RELATED MATTERS

Give your opinion of the following statements by circling one number corresponding to your choice.

	Agree	Disagree	Undecided	No opinion
1. Department Heads/Subject Area Coordinators should be given more released time for consultation.	1	2	3	4
2. If this released time for Department Heads/Subject Area Coordinators were made available, it should be at the expense of released time for Assistant Principals.	1	2	3	4
3. Assistant Principals should act as consultants for most subject areas.	1	2	3	4
4. Principals should spend more time in consultation with teachers.	1	2	3	4
5. Staff development meetings should be held mostly in the school where you teach rather than in another location.	1	2	3	4
6. University staff can fill certain needs in consultative services (e.g., as resource people for workshops, conducting action research, assisting with new programs).	1	2	3	4
7. Teachers of recognized ability who are not in any designated administrative position (i.e., not a Principal, Assistant Principal, Department Head) should be released on a scheduled basis to provide consultative help.	1	2	3	4

Additional Comments.

YOUR COOPERATION IN ANSWERING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS SINCERELY APPRECIATED. THANK YOU.

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW - CONSULTATIVE NEEDS OF TEACHERS

1. What is your position in this school?

   ____ Principal ____ Assistant Principal
   ____ Counsellor ____ Classroom Teacher
   ____ Librarian ____ Department Head/Subject Coordinator

2. Sex: ____ Female ____ Male

3. How many complete years of post-secondary education do you hold?

   ____ 1 ____ 3 ____ 5
   ____ 2 ____ 4 ____ 6 or more

4. How many years of teaching experience do you have?

   (a) Total ____
   (b) In St. Albert Protestant Separate School District ____
   (c) In your present school ____

5. In which subject area do you spend the greatest percentage of teaching time? _____

6. Is your teaching assignment generally consistent with your academic preparation?

   Yes ____ No ____

7. In which one of these grade levels do you spend the greatest percentage of your instructional time?

   ____ Do not teach ____ K- Gr. 3 ____ Gr. 4-6
   ____ Gr. 7-9 ____ Gr. 10-12

8. What particular consultative functions would be of most value to you?

9. Would you be in favor of the practice of giving selected teachers, because of their preparation and experience, certain consultative assignments without these being called "promotions" or "administrative positions" as such?

   (a) Yes ____ No ____ Undecided ____

   (b) Why did you answer in that way?

10. Do you feel that the need for consultation decreases with increased experience?

   (a) Your opinion:

   (b) In which years do you feel that the need for consultation is most necessary for the average teacher?

   (c) Please elaborate.

11. (a) In your first year of teaching which needs were the strongest?

(b) Which needs were not really taken care of?

12. Indicate which approach best serves you as a teacher in dealing with each of the areas of consultation indicated above.	Curriculum development	Instructional improvement	Technical assistance	Meeting pupil needs
(a) Discussion with another person				
(b) Small group session				
(c) Large group session				
(d) Uncertain				
(e) Several of these				

13. Comments

Table 28

Key to Abridged Task Area Statements

Ques. No.	Abridged Task Area Statements	Questionnaire Statements
1	Developing course outlines	Developing course outlines.
2	Planning lessons	Planning lessons and lesson units.
3	Using curriculum guides	Using Department of Education curriculum guides.
4	Selecting instructional materials	Selecting instructional and resource materials.
5	Developing teaching materials	Developing teaching materials.
6	Applying technology	Applying technology to the classroom.
7	Using instructional aids	Using instructional aids (e.g., films, transparencies, charts, kits).
8	Organizing classroom research	Organizing your classroom research.
9	Experimenting with methods	Experimenting with innovative methods.
10	Using a variety of techniques	Using a variety of instructional techniques and approaches.
11	Arranging for intervisitation	Making arrangements to consult teachers from other schools on instructional practices.

Table 28 (continued)

Ques. No.	Abridged Task Area Statements	Questionnaire Statements
12	Arranging to view programs	Arranging classroom visits within District to view program implementation.
13	Arranging for demonstrations	Making arrangements to observe demonstrations by other teachers of certain techniques.
14	Observing a specific problem	Observing and evaluating your teaching to help with a specific problem in teaching methodology.
15	Evaluating the teaching process	Observing and evaluating the teaching process in your classroom.
16	Solutions to teacher-student interaction	Finding solutions to problems related to teacher-student interaction.
17	Solutions of discipline problems	Becoming less dependent on other staff for solutions of discipline problems.
18	Information on background of students	Obtaining information on background of specific students.
19	Developing testing instruments	Developing instruments to measure pupil performance.
20	Interpreting standardized tests	Giving and interpreting standardized tests.

Table 28 (continued)

Ques. No.	Abridged Task Area Statements	Questionnaire Statements
21	Preparing report cards	Preparing pupil report cards.
22	Parent-teacher interviews	Planning and conducting parent-teacher interviews.
23	Individualizing programs	Individualizing programs to meet student needs.
24	Assessing the need for remedial programs	Assessing the need for remedial programs to overcome student weaknesses (e.g., learning disabilities).
25	Implementing remedial programs	Implementing remedial programs to overcome acknowledged student weaknesses (e.g., speech therapy).
26	Recognizing cases for referral	Recognizing potential cases for referral to outside agencies.
27	Relating information from agencies	Relating information from outside agencies (e.g., Alberta Guidance Clinic reports) to the classroom situation.
28	Discussing personal problems	Discussing your personal problems which you feel may be adversely affecting your teaching.